In The Matter Of:

BROOKLINE ZONING BOARD APPEALS HEARING

PROCEEDINGS - Vol. 7 June 5, 2014

MERRILL CORPORATION

LegaLink, Inc.

101 Arch Street 3rd Floor Boston, MA 02110 Phone: 617.542.0039 Fax: 617.542.2119

Volume VII

Pages 1-127

Brookline Zoning Board Appeals Hearing

Case Number 20130094

40B Application by Chestnut Hill Realty

The Residences of South Brookline

June 5, 2014 at 7:00 p.m.

Office of Town Counsel

333 Washington Street, 6th floor

Brookline, Massachusetts 02445

Merrill Corporation LegaLink, Inc.

179 Lincoln Street, Suite 401

Boston, Massachusetts 02111

(617) 542-0039 Fax (617) 542-2119

Reporter: Kristen C. Krakofsky

```
1
                            Appearances
 2
      Board Members:
 3
      Jessie Geller, Chairman
      Jonathan Book
 5
      Chris Hussey
      Mark Zuroff, Associate Member
 7
      Avi Liss, Associate Member
 8
      Samuel Nagler, Esquire, Krokidas & Bluestein
10
      Edith M. Netter, Esquire,
11
      Edith M. Netter & Associates, P.C.
12
     Alison Steinfeld,
13
      Planning & Community Development Director
14
      Dan Bennett, Building Commissioner
15
      Mel Kleckner, Town Administrator
16
17
      Representatives of Chestnut Hill Realty:
18
      Joseph Geller
      Mark Levin
19
2.0
      Members of the Public:
21
22
     Cyril Wolfe, 269 Russett Road
23
      Anthony Abner, 265 Russett Road
24
      Stephen Chiumenti, 262 Russett Road
```

```
Judith Leichtner, 121 Beverly Road
 1
 2
      David King, Mason Terrace
      Scott Gladstone, 383 Russett Road
 3
      Irene Scharf, 250 Russett Road
 5
      Betsy DeWitt, 94 Upland Road
      Nancy Daly, 161 Russett Road
      William Pu, 249 Beverly Road
 7
      Alisa Jonas
 8
      William Varrell, 45 Asheville Road
10
      Robin Koocher, Beverly Road
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	7:03 p.m.
3	MR. JESSIE GELLER: Good evening, everyone.
4	We're calling to order this continued hearing on the
5	Residences of South Brookline. As people are aware,
6	this is a continuation of a series of hearings we've
7	been holding. This is on a proposed 40B development
8	located in South Brookline.
9	Tonight's hearing is going to be dedicated to,
10	as I understand it, some modifications to the submittal
11	plan. Let me, before we get into the topic at hand,
12	renew introductions: Avi Liss all the way to the left;
13	Mark Zuroff; Jonathan Book; Christopher Hussey; Jessie
14	Geller; and our assistant Edie Netter, who is
15	consulting with us on 40B matters; and legal, Sam
16	Nagler.
17	Tonight's hearing will be in the following
18	order: We will first hear the presentation from
19	Chestnut Hill Realty. We will then hear a report by
20	the planning director, then the Board will have an
21	opportunity to ask questions and hold a discussion
22	based on what it has seen so far. We will then open up
23	the hearing to public testimony.
24	With respect to public testimony, what I would

ask people to do, and I said this before, one, listen 1 2 to what other people have to say; and if you agree with something that someone else has said before you, point 3 to them and say I agree with them. We don't need to 5 hear the same comment several times over, only because it will make for an extremely long hearing. We do want 7 to hear what you have to say, but we also want to be sensitive to time constraints. 8 Also, I would note for people that tonight's 10 hearing is focused on modifications on the plans that were submitted. And therefore, if you do have 11 comments, please focus those comments on the changes to 12 the plan. After public testimony, we will run through 13 14 a few administrative details. 15 A couple of questions I have for CHR, just preliminarily, is -- I understand that the plan has not 16 17 been provided a yet for the modifications. I would ask 18 that that be submitted. 19 (Documents submitted.) 20 MR. JESSIE GELLER: I would also note that a 21 model needs to be -- a completed model needs to be 22 submitted by June 6th, that's tomorrow, in order to 23 comply with our time limits. And that would be a 24 bird's eye view as well as a street view.

```
1
               Any other details? I think that's it.
 2
               Okay. Who's going to speak on behalf of CHR?
               MR. LEVIN: Good evening, Chairman Geller,
 3
      board members. I'm Mark Levin, Chestnut Hill Realty.
 5
               I'd first like to thank the planning staff
      whose thoughtful input has generated many of the ideas
      that I'm going to present tonight.
 8
               Last November we submitted a comprehensive
      permit application. The Town of Brookline subsequently
10
      hired Edith Netter to consult on the 40B process.
      Town also hired BETA to do stormwater and traffic peer
11
12
      review and Touloukian & Touloukian to do peer review of
13
      the design.
14
               The planning staff went on a site walk to view
15
      the existing conditions. The planning staff has made a
16
      number of suggestions to make modifications to the
17
      original plan. Specifically, they emphasized the need
18
      to preserve more useable green space in the S7 and thus
19
      preserve more of the existing mature trees there.
2.0
      asked that we eliminate the larger sized units and move
21
      units from the S7 to the M5 district. They asked for
22
      us to eliminate 1 eight-unit building entirely and
      reduce the mass of the infill buildings. They asked
23
      that we improve the view corridors for the neighbors
24
```

and increase the setbacks of the buildings and parking 1 2 wherever possible. Chestnut Hill Realty and the planning staff 3 met over the last few months to discuss how to achieve 5 these goals. Our team has worked very diligently to make modifications to our plan to meet the Town's 7 objectives. We're here presenting these modifications 8 to the ZBA tonight. This is the original site plan. You can see 10 Beverly Road to the north -- this is the west side, the original site plan to the west side -- Beverly Road to 11 12 the north, Independence Drive to the east. You can see 13 there were 4 eight-unit buildings, 1 four-unit 14 building, for a total of 36 units of which 15 were 15 four-bedrooms, 13 three-bedrooms, 5 two-bedrooms, and 3 16 one-bedrooms. There were also 2 free-standing 17 garages. There was a 20-foot setback behind the 18 buildings and the parking. 19 Here we see the modifications that are under 2.0 consideration on the west side. There's now 1 21 eight-unit building and 3 four-unit buildings for a 2.2 total of 20 units. There are no four-bedrooms, there are 10 three-bedrooms, 10 two-bedrooms, and no 23 24 garages. 1 eight-unit building was removed entirely,

four units were moved across the driveway to the M5 1 2 district, 8 units were relocated to the apartment 3 building in the M5 district. We've added 27 parking spaces and located all 5 of the parking as far from the neighbors as possible by moving closer to Hancock Village. We designed this 7 parking similar to what exists currently at Hancock 8 Village. As you can see, the new result is creating significantly more open space and preserves 10 significantly more mature trees. Joe Geller will speak to that later. He'll also discuss the removal of the 11 12 retaining wall and the creation of a turn-around for 13 fire trucks. There is now significant green space 14 behind most of the homes on Beverly Road. 15 Here you see the original. This is the original submission -- it's marked incorrectly at the 16 17 top -- on the east side. You see Russett Road over 18 here. There are 3 eight-unit buildings, one, two, and 19 three; and 4 four-unit buildings, one, two, three, four; totaling 40 units of which 13 were four-bedrooms, 20 21 15 three-bedrooms, 5 two-bedrooms, 7 one-bedrooms, and 22 there are 5 garages. 2.3 Now, this is the June 5th modified plan. There's now 1 eight-unit building and 4 four-unit 24

buildings for a total of 24 units of which there are no 1 2 four-bedrooms, 8 three-bedrooms, 8 two-bedrooms, and 8 3 one-bedrooms. 2 eight-unit buildings were reduced to four-unit buildings by relocating 8 units into the 5 apartment building. All of the units in the 2 four-unit building were relocated to the apartment 7 building, thus eliminating these two buildings. 8 Combined, 16 units were moved to the apartment building in the M5. 10 As we looked to the changes of the plan, it 11 became obvious that we needed more parking spaces. 12 fact, the parking on the east side still does not meet 13 zoning, despite the fact that we've added 57 surface 14 spaces and, again, we moved the parking as far as 15 possible from the neighbors. 16 So let's look at the impacts in the S7. I'll 17 first focus on building mass. We reduced the number of buildings from twelve to eight, and we reduced the 18 19 number of eight-unit buildings from seven to two while adding 1 four-unit building. The number of apartments 20 21 in the modifications have been reduced by thirty-six to 22 forty and the building square footage has nearly 2.3 halved. 24 The stories have dropped from two and a half

to two plus a loft enabling to us reduce the height of 1 2 these buildings by three feet. The free-standing garages have been eliminated 3 completely. 5 The two remaining eight-unit buildings in this plan are located adjacent to Independence Drive, and 6 7 the reduction in the square footage in the S7 was achieved by moving units to M5 and the deductions of 8 bedrooms. All the buildings in the S7 have you been 10 reduced by three feet. 11 Now, here you have two elevations. elevation is a typical eight-unit building in our 12 13 permit application. It's two and a half stories. 14 Below it is our four-unit building in our modifications 15 under consideration that are two stories plus a loft. 16 The massing was reduced by virtue of the removal of 17 bedrooms in the three- and four-bedroom units and the 18 reduction in height that resulted from going from two 19 and a half stories to two stories plus a loft. We went 20 from seven of the eight-unit buildings above to two by 21 converting 4 eight-unit buildings to four-unit 22 buildings and eliminating 1 eight-unit building 23 entirely. 24 Let's look at the impact on unit types. All

28 of the four-bedrooms units have been eliminated and 1 2 10 of the three-bedroom units have been eliminated as 3 There are eight more two-bedrooms units and two less one bedroom-units. In all, there was previously 5 226 bedrooms in the S7. Now there are only 88, for a reduction of 128. The total number of lofts as asterisked above is 22 and the 18 three-bedroom units equal 10 percent of the total project, which is the 8 state requirement by MassDevelopment. 10 The impact on the green space and mature trees on unobstructed views: The functional useable open 11 space has increased by nearly three acres. The useable 12 open space between the 20-foot setback that existed in 13 14 both plans and 60 feet from the property line has 15 increased by over 300 percent. The building footprints themselves have been reduced by 37 percent, and the 16 17 covered surfaces, that's the building footprint plus driveways and parking, have reduced by 22 percent. 18 19 mature trees saved are now 123, and the linear feet of 20 unobstructed view has nearly doubled while the 21 retaining walls have been reduced significantly. 2.2 unobstructed views are almost 80 percent of the entire 23 length of the property. 24 I'd like to discuss modifications under

- 1 consideration to the apartment building. These
- 2 modifications include an added fifth floor to
- 3 accommodate the 24 units that were removed from the
- 4 S7. These 24 units are comprised of 19 two-bedrooms
- 5 and 5 one-bedrooms. We also moved the main entrance to
- 6 the south side of the building and created an
- 7 attractive two-story amenity space. We also relocated
- 8 the garage entrance.
- 9 Here's an image of the south side of the
- building with the new amenity space. This is clearly
- 11 not the final design, but please note that this is not
- 12 visible from the abutters.
- 13 Now I'd like to turn over the presentation to
- 14 Joe Geller who will discuss site modifications.
- MR. JOE GELLER: Thank you, Mark.
- So Mark talked about the overall details of
- 17 the modifications of the plans, so I'm going to talk
- 18 about some of the more general site circulation, site
- 19 design, site modifications.
- 20 So there's general traffic safety improvements
- 21 that I will show as I go through the plans. We looked
- 22 at certain things like better emergency vehicle
- 23 access. We did meet with the director of planning and
- 24 the fire chief to talk about his concerns about the

plan and show him an earlier version of the plan and 1 how we could actually solve some of those, and I'll 2. talk about that in a little more detail. 3 You saw at the last hearing the proposal for 5 traffic calming on Independence Drive, and that would be included in this proposal as well, so we wanted to make sure that you understood that that was integral to what we're proposing as part of the modifications under 8 consideration. 10 And then I'll talk also about potential future access to the VFW Parkway, something that we can 11 consider working with the Town on, although not 12 13 included in this current plan. 14 So some other modifications: One thing that 15 came up was along the edge of the property, the entire 16 edge of the property both on the east and west side, 17 was adding fencing. That was a consistent fence, six-foot fence all along the edge of the property. 18 19 It's something that we certainly wanted to do and would 2.0 like to do. 21 And then also to increase and enhance the 22 landscaping along that property line. We haven't 23 finalized that yet, and we intend to do that as we move

forward with these plans as they're being considered.

24

And then Mark talked about mature trees 1 2 I'll show you where those are and what the 3 significance of that is. And it also -- there were retaining walls shown on the plan originally, one was 5 on the west side and two on the east side. eliminated the wall on the west side completely, and the walls on the east side, we removed one of them and 8 I'll show you in the plans how we actually still have a wall there but now it's actually designed to have less 10 impact on the abutting properties. 11 One of the things that was talked about a lot 12 in the discussions about the plan was unobstructed view shed, and I think in discussing what that is, it's 13 14 really that there's no buildings in the area -- in the 15 S7 area to really impact the view from the neighbors both at the ground plane but also in the upper 16 17 stories. So you can see that sort of these areas here 18 area where we eliminated buildings along the edge of 19 the property and so that view shed is into the current 20 green space, the green space that will be maintained. 21 That was the 79 percent unchanged view shed. 22 The additional mature trees that we saved --23 you can see we had buildings -- we had buildings in 24 this area and this area before. And so by eliminating

those buildings, we're able to save all these trees 1 2 here, all of these trees in this location here, and then the trees in the back. In the relocation, we were 3 able to actually modify the grading as well to maintain 5 this edge in the buffer on that side there. On the east side, by eliminating the buildings 7 here, here, and here, and the garages, we were able to 8 maintain all of the plantings here by regrading this area and this parking. We don't do anything in this 10 area here, so we maintain all of the trees in this location. This building was eliminated, so we maintain 11 12 all the trees in that location, and then we were able to grade differently down here because we had a smaller 13 14 building here and these buildings got relocated so that 15 we end up with more trees saved in this location and 16 currently we're showing trees saved at that point as 17 well. 18 So the total number of trees saved is 123 mature trees. And I know that when we walked out on 19 2.0 the site there were a lot of concerns about specific 21 trees and so we looked to save as many of those large 22 trees as we could. 23 One of the things that we did talk about was 24 the access to the VFW. So if that was possible, you'd

be able to either come in or go out from this point 1 here and that's why this building is located where it 2. is, so that there's potential to have a future access 3 drive here. And that would allow cars to come in this 5 way and go out that way. It's something that we'd consider working with the Town on but we are not proposing as part of the modifications because of the 8 process involved in that. As I said, there's only one retaining wall 10 left on the site now. The plan, as shown, is that you come in off of Asheville here, you turn left into the 11 drive here. Before, the buildings were located here, 12 and then there was a building on an angle here. By 13 14 moving the drive in this location, we were able to push 15 the buildings farther away from the abutting properties and the wall. Instead of having the wall on the 16 17 property side, having to grade down to the properties, 18 we ended up building the wall on this side and actually 19 lowering the building here. So we were able to regrade 20 this part of the site. 21 So this wall -- adding a wall on this side, 22 maintaining a wall on this part of the site is actually 23 done so that we can actually have a better relationship 24 to the property line. And the same thing, we've

eliminated the wall on this whole edge on this side. 1 2 So another comment that's been made was about 3 emergency access concerns that the fire chief had. so in our discussion with the fire chief, one of the 5 things we talked about was the length of this driveway and him having to use the hammerhead turn to get out of that driveway and also the width of this driveway in this whole section, concerns about passing of the fire trucks. You heard that at the last hearing from the 10 deputy chief as well. 11 So what we've done is we've created a 12 traditional turn-around at this location. It takes up more pavement, but we're able to actually get a truck 13 14 to turn around in that whole area and go back out. 15 We've maintained a 22-foot-wide pavement width there. I think we had shown 20 feet in some locations before. 16 We talked to the chief about a 22-foot or 23-foot-wide 17 pavement, which he was more comfortable with. So we 18 19 have a 22-foot-wide minimum there. It's wider in 20 certain sections where the parking is shown along the 21 whole -- so when there's parking, it's a little bit 22 wider to pull out of the parking spaces. 23 So we feel we've given a very comfortable 24 driveway in there so the trucks can pass. If a truck

pulls up and is working the fire scene, as the chief 1 2 described to us, they want to be able to get past it, turn around, and get back out so if there's another 3 call or something like that, they can accomplish that. 5 I think we've done that with this plan. We also talked with him at the time about the 7 modification here where now that we're only showing two 8 buildings here and two buildings here and the third building here with an assess drive that came off of 10 Asheville this way, that we still have a hammerhead in this location, still the hammerhead in this location, 11 12 but we're only servicing fewer buildings. 13 And then his other concern was access to the 14 back of this building, the large building. And so we 15 talked with him about putting a grass-free-type paving system in the back of the building so we still maintain 16 17 a green space back there, to all intents and purposes 18 appear as a green space, but the grass-free could allow 19 fire-lane access to the back of the building, which he 2.0 was comfortable with as well. And then, of course, we 21 were able to give access -- at this point he would have 2.2 direct access onto the VFW in the future. 23 So we had a meeting with him. We'd actually want to go back and show him one more time the final 24

plans, but we think we've addressed the concerns that 1 2 he had. 3 And this just shows the AutoTURN that you're all now getting very familiar with and how the AutoTURN would work in each one of these points for fire access. 5 Just to kind of wrap up, I think the other 7 issues that have come up in the discussion that we had 8 over the last few months, it's one of the things that the Town had some questions about, was our stormwater 10 management system and use of pervious pavement. We believe we'll be able to -- first of all, 11 we're reducing the amount of pervious surfaces to begin 12 13 with, so we'll be making improvements to the stormwater 14 system as we proposed it because we'll have less 15 impact. So from the very beginning of the modifications, we're able to address part of those 16 17 issues. But we also believe, because of the way we can grade the site, because of the additional open space on 18 19 the site, we're able to modify the stormwater system so 2.0 that it can be something that we can work with the Town 21 on and I think we can have a better -- the system will 22 address the problems or concerns that people had at 23 some of the hearings. 24 We still believe that the pervious pavement

system is a good use of proven technology, but we'll 1 2 work with the Town on understanding that better. 3 MR. LEVIN: So I just wanted to summarize the modifications presented tonight. 5 We've eliminated 8 units, so the program is now 184 total. We removed 36 units from S7, which now contains 40 units. 28 units were moved into the M.5, 4 of which were a four-unit building on the west side, 24 on the fifth floor of the apartment building. We 10 removed four buildings from the S7, and we removed 81 bedrooms in the aggregate. 128 we were removed from 11 12 the infill buildings. 13 We removed all seven free-standing garages and 14 we reduced the height of the infill buildings by three 15 feet. We converted 4 eight-unit buildings into four-unit buildings, and we've nearly doubled the 16 17 linear footage of unobstructed views. 18 As far as the unit types go, as I've mentioned, we've eliminated all the four-bedroom units 19 2.0 and we've reduced the three-bedroom units by 10 to 18. 21 There are 22 lofts of which 17 are in the two-bedroom 22 units, four are in the one-bedroom units, and one is in the three-bedroom unit. The affordable units have been 2.3 reduced by 2 to 37. 24

1 As far as the site improvements go, as Joe mentioned earlier, we increased the functional useable 2 3 open space to almost three acres and we saved 123 mature trees. We will improve public safety on Independence Drive through traffic calming. Those 5 plans are being worked on in conjunction with BETA. 7 And we've improved stormwater management. 8 increased setbacks from neighboring homes. We moved two of the three retaining walls, and we'll improve the 10 fencing and landscaping behind neighboring homes. 11 We look forward to your feedback. There's a 12 lot of information here, but we're more than happy to try to answer any questions you have. I'm happy to say 13 14 that we ran these modifications by MassDevelopment, and 15 they were received very positively. If you're in agreement, I imagine that the staff will retain the 16 17 peer reviewers to review these considered 18 modifications. 19 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Thank you. Are there any 20 questions at this point for representatives of CHR on 21 the modifications or on the plan in general? MR. BOOK: Could you spend a couple of minutes 22 23 and describe the -- sort of the process to provide 24 direct access onto VFW Parkway and, you know, in terms

- of -- you talked about it as a possibility and I guess
- 2 I just want to explore for a couple of minutes how
- 3 likely that possibility could be, how difficult is it,
- 4 what would prevent -- you know, what would be the
- 5 obstacles to doing that.
- 6 MR. JOE GELLER: The process is because it's a
- 7 DCR roadway which now falls under -- because the DCR
- 8 and MassHighway and all the other industries combined
- 9 into the Mass DOT, it requires the Mass DOT highway
- 10 access program. So there's a rather involved process
- 11 that goes with that. It's also a historic parkway, so
- 12 there's concerns and issues with that as well. It's
- 13 something that -- it's just an involved permitting
- 14 process. It goes through the state.
- MR. BOOK: So is the -- I guess I was
- 16 trying -- is the issue all with, we'll do it if we can
- 17 get state approvals? I guess I didn't fully understand
- 18 if you were at a stage in your planning that you were
- 19 committed to it if it could be done.
- 20 MR. JOE GELLER: Yes. I think we said that we
- 21 would work with the Town to achieve that if it was
- 22 possible to achieve it, but we didn't want to include
- 23 it in the plans if we couldn't get it achieved.
- MR. BOOK: Okay. Thank you.

```
1
               MR. JESSIE GELLER: Any other questions?
 2
               MR. ZUROFF: Yes. You've mentioned height
 3
      reductions in the smaller buildings, but the apartment
 4
      building itself, what's the net effect on the apartment
 5
      building of these modifications?
 6
               MR. LEVIN: By adding a floor, a fifth floor,
 7
      what was previously a fourth floor, I would imagine
      that we're nominally adding 10 to 11 feet in height.
 8
               MR. ZUROFF: And in terms of driveway access
10
      and parking, are you increasing the number of spaces?
11
      There's parking under the building; right?
12
               MR. LEVIN: There is parking under the
      building.
13
14
               MR. ZUROFF: So are you increasing the number
      of spaces commensurate with the number of units?
15
16
               MR. LEVIN: The garage parking count is not
17
      changing. The parking that would be -- the additional
18
      parking that would be required we envision would be in
19
      the lot -- in the lot right here and the spaces that we
20
      created on the drive going into the building.
21
               MR. ZUROFF: How much of an extension of the
22
      footprint is there?
2.3
               MR. LEVIN: Of the building itself?
24
               MR. ZUROFF: Yes.
```

1 MR. LEVIN: None. 2 Well, to the extent that there is the entryway where there's a drive under, there's a nominal increase 3 in the footprint at the amenity space. The second 5 floor, though, would be bigger than the first floor, so it's a footprint -- the square footage that's added is 7 primarily on the second floor. 8 MR. ZUROFF: But you're expanding the footprint because you've got to --10 MR. LEVIN: Support it, right, where there's a drive through underneath it. As we envision it now, 11 12 that's underdeveloped. 13 MR. HUSSEY: Where's the main entrance now to 14 the apartment building? 15 MR. LEVIN: On the south side. 16 MR. HUSSEY: Is there a drop off area there as 17 well? 18 MR. LEVIN: Yes, there is. 19 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Mr. Geller, can you speak 20 to the -- you've mentioned the fact that drainage had 21 been improved, although you still firmly believe in pervious pavement. Can you get more into the details 22 23 of what's been eliminated and how you've addressed it? 24 MR. JOE GELLER: I wish I could. I can get

into not very specific details because we're just 1 2 starting to actually redesign the drainage system. what we're looking at is how we can do that in a way 3 that responds to some of the concerns. 5 MR. JESSIE GELLER: But is your focus on moving towards a more conversational means of 7 drainage? MR. JOE GELLER: Yes. There may be a combination of conventional and less conventional. 10 I think that that's what we heard at the meetings, and 11 we heard some concerns from the peer reviewers, so we 12 will work with BETA on this so that we have that review 13 done at the same time. 14 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Okay. And that will be 15 presented to us and we'll have an opportunity to take 16 a look at what alternatives --17 MR. JOE GELLER: Yes. 18 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Thank you. 19 Anything else? 2.0 (No response.) 21 There may be, so ... 22 I'd like to call the planning director to 23 provide us with a report at this point. 24 MS. STEINFELD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Allison Steinfeld, planning director. 1 2 During the past few months, representatives of the Town's planning, building, and legal departments 3 along with the Town's legal and planning consultants 5 have been engaged in working sessions with Chestnut Hill Realty over the proposed 40B project at Hancock 7 Village. No members of any elected or appointed boards 8 have participated in these working sessions and staff has not been authorized to negotiate or reach an 10 agreement. 11 The revised plan that Chestnut Hill Realty is presenting tonight has not been endorsed by any 12 13 representative or body of the town. These working 14 sessions are consistent with the standard 40B process 15 and are, in fact, encouraged by the state. 16 The working sessions have provided the Town's 17 representatives with opportunities to discuss the plan 18 with Chestnut Hill Realty and to encourage Chestnut 19 Hill Realty to prepare a revised plan that address the 20 concerns of the Town and neighborhood. During these 21 working sessions, the Town's representatives were 22 committed to furthering at three fundamental 23 objectives: 24 Number 1, to retain as much useable open space

1 as possible within the greenbelt. 2. Number 2, to reduce the visual impact of the development on the abutting single-family homes. 3 And Number 3, to minimize the impact on the 5 school system as much as possible even though fiscal impacts are beyond the scope of 40B review. 7 Chestnut Hill Realty has made the following 8 changes to the plan: The total number of residential units would be 10 reduced from 192 to 184; the total number of bedrooms 11 would be reduced by 81; 24, three- and four-bedroom 12 units would be converted to one- and two-bedroom units 13 and relocated from the greenbelt to the apartment 14 building. There would be no four-bedroom units. 1.5 The original 12 residential buildings located 16 in the greenbelt would be reduced to eight. A ninth 17 building, which has four units, would be moved outside 18 the greenbelt in between two existing Hancock Village 19 buildings. The number of eight-unit buildings would be 2.0 reduced from seven to two. 21 All seven garages have been eliminated from 22 the greenbelt. Approximately three acres of useable open space in the greenbelt would be preserved, along 23

with an additional 84 mature trees.

24

1 The height of both eight-unit buildings and all 7 four-unit buildings would be reduced by 2 approximately three feet. Two of the three retaining 3 walls would be eliminated. 5 The hammerhead, identified by the fire chief as the most problematic, would be replaced with a 7 turn-around. 8 If the ZBA grants a comprehensive permit, Chestnut Hill Realty would submit an application to 10 MassDOT for a curb cut to provide access to the development from the VFW parkway. 11 12 Additional surface parking would be 13 introduced, but most parking would be moved away from 14 the single-family abutters and closer to the existing 15 Hancock Village development. Setbacks from the 16 abutting single-family property owners would be 17 increased. 18 There are still many issues to be addressed 19 and resolved. Most notably, Town representatives are 20 concerned about the massing of the apartment building. 21 The Town has engaged an urban design peer reviewer who 22 will be reviewing the site and building design and 23 providing us preliminary comments at the next hearing. 24 The introduction of lofts within 22 units is a

- 1 concern as these spaces could easily be converted to 2 bedrooms, exacerbating the Town's school space crisis.
- 3 In addition, parking, traffic, stormwater, drainage,
- 4 and other development aspects remain under review.
- 5 However, in view of the significant
- 6 constraints imposed by Chapter 40B upon municipalities,
- 7 it is the professional opinion of town staff that
- 8 overall the revised plan is better than the original
- 9 plan. Moving forward, peer review of the project will
- 10 continue and we look forward to comments from the
- 11 public and guidance from you.
- 12 Thank you.
- MR. JESSIE GELLER: Thank you.
- MR. HUSSEY: Allison, we heard of an
- 15 architectural consultant that's part of the team now,
- but we haven't heard from them. Have they been
- 17 involved in this negotiation, or will they be reporting
- 18 later on it?
- 19 MS. STEINFELD: We've had some preliminary
- discussions with the consultant, but he's not been
- 21 charged to undertake review until presentation of the
- 22 alternative plan. We'll, pending your approval, be
- 23 authorized to begin tomorrow.
- MR. HUSSEY: Good. Thank you.

```
MS. NETTER: I just wanted to underline that
 1
      there has been no negotiations during the sessions.
 2
      There's been conversation, but staff has not been
 3
      authorized to negotiate on behalf of the Town.
 5
               MR. HUSSEY: I see. Okay.
               MS. STEINFELD: And with your permission,
 7
      Mr. Chairman, if I could just make a note, the planning
 8
      department will have the plans put online, if not
      tonight, then certainty first thing in the morning.
10
               MR. JESSIE GELLER: Thank you.
               Members of the Board, we've heard a fair
11
      amount of testimony to date and we have yet to hear
12
      both the response, the second round on drainage, which
13
14
      is coming up in a future hearing, and we have, as
15
      Mr. Hussey just raised, yet to hear from the peer
16
      review on design.
17
               Having said that, preliminarily, does anyone
      want to begin the conversation about what we have seen,
18
19
      good, bad, or indifferent, and raise any comments?
2.0
               MR. LISS: Based on the revised site plan?
21
               MR. JESSIE GELLER: Based on the revised plan
22
      as compared to what we have previously seen, concerns
23
      that may still exist, what's good, what's bad.
               MR. LISS. I'll start. I think I echo the
24
```

comments of Ms. Steinfeld that overall this is a better 1 2 plan than the previous plan submitted, if we're basing 3 it on that. Specifically, I commend CHR for changing the 5 hammerhead into a turn-around. That was clearly something that members of our service and the fire 7 department were concerned about, and that was addressed 8 properly. The 22 foot minimum for a pass-through is also 10 very important, and I think it's very clear that entrance and exit was made a very important decision --11 12 or an important factor in the safety of not only the 13 residents for, obviously, access, but also for members 14 of the fire department and emergency response teams to 15 get in and out. So I commend that. 16 I think that, overall, saving trees is 17 tremendous, a good use of the space. You know, and the 18 concerns that I reserve are those that Ms. Steinfeld also addressed, that I would like to hear from the 19 20 urban planner, the peer review on the impact of the 21 larger building. 2.2 However, considering what they've done on the west side in the S7 district, you know, there is going 23 24 to be an impact on the M5 and I think that they've done

- very well with what -- you know, with what they've
- 2 done.
- 3 Some of the considerations about impact on
- 4 schools unfortunately is not something that we can
- 5 consider, so that I removed from the table, you know,
- 6 whether fortunate or unfortunate.
- 7 I like the loft idea. I think it's --
- 8 personally. But, again, I'm really not an architect.
- 9 I'm going to look to the urban planner for impact on
- 10 that. But otherwise, this plan is, yes, better than
- 11 the previous plan.
- MR. JESSIE GELLER: Thank you.
- 13 Anybody else?
- MR. ZUROFF: I'll chime in and say that I'm
- impressed that there are significant modifications
- 16 being proposed.
- 17 My concern is that, since we don't have the
- 18 actual design and proposal in front of us, that we have
- 19 the possibility of having further peer review of the
- 20 modifications. And we're up against a time deadline
- 21 and I'm concerned for the Board, that we have enough
- 22 time and that the other town boards that are involved
- 23 have enough time to review this and give it proper
- 24 consideration.

1 Mr. Chairman, are we going to have enough time 2 to consider these modifications? 3 MR. JESSIE GELLER: We will make sure we have 4 enough time. 5 MR. ZUROFF: Well, we may have enough meetings, but I'm questioning whether the peer reviewer 6 7 is going to have enough. 8 MR. JESSIE GELLER: We are told that the peer reviewer can come in with a preliminary report on the -- I think -- is that correct? 10 11 MS. NETTER: Correct. 12 MR. JESSIE GELLER: -- on the 19th, which will 13 then be followed with a final report on July 10th, 14 currently July 10th. 1.5 MR. ZUROFF: If they can meet those 16 deadlines. 17 MR. JESSIE GELLER: That was the basis on which they were engaged, that they would meet the 18 19 deadline. So yes, we will get both preliminary and 20 final reports back that we can work with. We'll also 21 obviously have the opportunity to re-review drainage. 2.2 And there will be tweaks. That will have to be 23 flushed, how they're going to deal with this issue of 24 where they're retaining the pervious pavement versus

1 going with a conventional system. 2 Those are very different MR. ZUROFF: 3 designs. MR. JESSIE GELLER: It will all happen within 5 our time frame. MR. ZUROFF: All right. As my final comment, 7 I am still concerned about the apartment building and I 8 am --MR. JESSIE GELLER: Concerned in what way? 10 MR. ZUROFF: Well, it's increasing in size and 11 number of units. 12 And one other concern I have is the 13 affordability factor. I know what they have proposed, 14 and my comment on that, my pronouncement, is that I 15 hope that we can encourage the developer to have 16 consideration for what is affordable. Even if it is 17 South Brookline, it is still -- the purpose of 40B, in 18 my opinion, is to increase affordable housing and the 19 net result is to allow developers to do this. But I'm 20 hopeful that the -- well, we know the sizes of the 21 units have declined, and I'm hoping that that will increase the affordability for the community for those 22 units. It's just my concern, and it's something that 23 hopefully the developer will consider. 24

1 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Anybody else? 2 MR. HUSSEY: Yes. I'd like to just point out that the reduction in the bedrooms also affects the 3 parking, the amount of parking that's required, so 5 that's an improvement. 6 I am not worried about the peer review. I 7 sure that can be done in time. The major work has been 8 done, so I suspect that we'll be able to meet that deadline. 9 10 I'd like to make a motion, I quess, such as will be required to start the architectural peer 11 12 review. 13 MR. LISS: Second it. 14 MR. HUSSEY: I'm not sure what the wording 15 should be, but ... 16 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Motion to engage peer 17 reviewer for review of the design, urban design. 18 MR. HUSSEY: Planning design. Architectural 19 design? 2.0 MR. JESSIE GELLER: I think it's the entire --21 MR. HUSSEY: I see a difference between the 22 two, and I'd like to have both words in there if 23 possible, planning and architectural review. 24 MR. JESSIE GELLER: I assume that's correct.

```
1
               MS. STEINFELD: Site and building design
 2
      review.
 3
               MR. JESSIE GELLER: Those words work for you?
               MR. HUSSEY: They work.
 5
               MR. JESSIE GELLER: Okay. All in favor?
 6
               THE BOARD:
                          Aye.
 7
               MR. JESSIE GELLER: They will be engaged
 8
      effective tomorrow. Thank you.
               Any other comments?
10
               MR. HUSSEY: Just one other question. I know
      it was mentioned, but what will determine whether
11
12
      you -- or when you make application to the state for
13
      the VFW access? That's been mentioned, but I didn't
14
      make note about it. But it just would require our
15
      approval or state approval or what sets that in motion?
16
               MR. LEVIN: I would say that an issuance of a
17
      comprehensive permit with conditions that need not be
18
      appealed by us. In other words, a project that we can
      live with and we move forward to get that access.
19
2.0
               MR. HUSSEY: Approval by this board is what
21
      you're referring to?
22
               MR. LEVIN: Correct.
23
               MR. HUSSEY: Okay. Thank you.
24
               MR. LEVIN: I need to interject on the design
```

We have, currently, a rudimentary model which 1 2 we really do not believe is worthy of review. model would be upgraded to a worthy model by the middle 3 of next week, by Wednesday. I believe that there's 5 enough design elements to be reviewed in the meantime on the architectural side as we've done the architecturals for those infill buildings as well as some basic changes to the five-story building. So I'm 8 just letting you know that the model that we have will 10 be available next Wednesday. MS. NETTER: As you know, we're under 11 stringent constraints as to timing. Those constraints 12 are established by the statute. And our understanding 13 14 with peer review consultants is that we needed to have 15 that model by tomorrow so that he can perform a 16 preliminary report. As it is, staff has been pushing 17 him very hard to get that initial report since we feel 18 it's very important. 19 So we will see. We are trying to work within 20 those time constraints but, as you know, if the 21 developer cannot provide the information in a fashion 22 that is timely according to the needs of our 23 consultant, we may have to seek additional time, so we 24 have to check with the peer review consultant. We know

```
you're working as hard as you can, but those are our
 1
 2
      constraints.
 3
               MR. JESSIE GELLER: Anything else,
 4
      Mr. Hussey?
               MR. HUSSEY: No. I think not at this time.
 5
               MR. JESSIE GELLER: Let me say this: I am
 6
 7
      glad to see elimination of much of the density. I
      frankly was not a huge fan of the garages. I thought
 8
      they took up a lot of space, and I was not clear on
10
      what the benefit was. I thought there was a lot of
      programing within the space. I'm not one that
11
12
      necessarily believes that there needs to be strict
13
      adherence to keeping the so-called green space open.
14
               On the other hand, it seems to me that there
      is some degree of consistency with the rough design of
15
16
      Hancock Village that should, to some extent, be adhered
17
      to.
18
               It seems to me that this modified plan does a
19
      better job of at least respecting some degree of open
      space, less density, so I'm happy to see that.
20
21
               I think the quid pro quo is, of course, that
22
      it puts pressure on moving improvements elsewhere, and
2.3
      I'm sure we'll have further comments and discusses
24
      about where they've relocated those improvements. But
```

generally I think, in particular, reducing the number 1 2 of structures and relocating the drives within these 3 areas is an improvement. And I'd also add that one other concern, in 5 particular, that I have from the original plan is the level of pressure for access on Asheville Road. an important piece here is trying to get access 8 directly to VFW Parkway because it clearly takes pressure off of Asheville Road. At least in my view it 10 would. I'm not a traffic engineer, but that seems logical to me, and I would certainly think that that 11 12 would be a critical component to this. I understand 13 that you're subject to state requirements, and that is 14 not an easy process, but I would certainly expect that 15 that would be something that would be pursued 16 vigorously. As to the rest of it, I, frankly -- although 17 I'm glad to see that you have consulted with the 18 19 emergency services and have made modifications based on 20 concerns that were raised -- frankly, it seems to me 21 that the Town of Brookline has accepted these 22 hammerhead designs elsewhere within the town, so I was 23 not, frankly, as focused on that as long as emergency 24 vehicles would have the ability to adequately move back

```
1
      and forth.
 2
               I think those are my preliminary comments.
               MR. HUSSEY: I'd like to, if I may, Chairman,
 3
      go back to the issue of the model. There's a deadline
 5
      tomorrow that the peer reviewer see the model? Is that
      what you're saying? I'm trying to look for a way
      around that a little bit.
 8
               MS. NETTER: As I understand it, staff is,
      again, trying to strongly encourage this peer review
10
      process to begin, and it is critical that the peer
11
      reviewer get the information that he needs. Again, we
12
      will confirm with the peer reviewer just what he can do
13
      within the two-week constraints. That's all we can
14
      say.
15
               MR. HUSSEY: What I'm wondering about --
      models in general, quite frankly, are more important to
16
17
      neighborhoods and boards who are not familiar with
18
      architectural design than architectures. And I'm
      wondering if, in fact, the peer reviewer, the
19
20
      architectural peer reviewer can go see the model in the
21
      model shop as a way to give them a sense as to how much
22
      more they need in order to sign off on it -- not sign
      off on it, but can get themselves started. That's what
23
24
      I'm looking at.
```

```
1
               MS. STEINFELD: The urban design peer reviewer
      engaged by the ZBA has not yet seen this plan.
 2
      intent is to get him as much information tomorrow as
 3
      possible so he can begin. Clearly, his preference was
 5
      to have the model. I will talk to him tomorrow once he
      receives the information that Chestnut Hill Realty is
 7
      able to provide and then get a better sense of exactly
      when he has to have the model and also the extent to
 8
      which his -- how expansive his preliminary report can
10
      be in two weeks. But he can't give me that advice
      until he sees the plan.
11
12
               MR. HUSSEY: Okay. Thank you.
13
               MR. JESSIE GELLER: We will now have testimony
14
      from the public. Just by a rough showing of hands, how
15
     many people would like to speak this evening?
16
               So if people would line up to the left.
17
      you speak, start by giving us your name and give us
18
      your address. Also, I just would remind people that
19
      what we are reviewing tonight are the modified plans,
20
      so if you could focus your comment on the modified
21
     plan, I would appreciate it. Listen to what other
22
     people have to say and if you agree with them, please
23
      let us know but we don't need to hear the same
24
      commentary opinions.
```

MS. WOLFE: My name is Cyril Wolfe. I live at 1 269 Russet Road. I've lived in Brookline for over 50 2. 3 years. I taught at the Baker School for 25 years. I think, because of my connection with the school and 5 the area, that Mr. Zuker and Chestnut Hill Realty has been playing with the neighborhood since he came in and 7 he revised the circle in the front of Baker School and 8 put a statue there. When he did that, he never bothered to check 10 and see the significance of that area. That area had trees in it that were planted in memory of children 11 that had died while they were with the Baker School. 12 13 It was never checked to see what it was all about. 14 trees were removed. 15 He then was told -- at least there was enough nonsense within the neighborhood to say to him they had 16 17 to do something and they put the trees back but it 18 wasn't the same because once you've removed -- like in 19 any area like that, you've removed it. It's 2.0 different. 21 My feeling is that he has no sincere feelings 22 for the Baker School area or for the Town of 2.3 Brookline. 24 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Thank you.

1 MR. ABNER: My name is Anthony Abner. I live 2 at 265 Russett Road, and I want to talk specifically about the building height issue and the fifth floor, 3 which is really a seventh floor to the apartment 5 building. So I realize nobody here wants to hear about 7 mathematical equations and so on, but if you'll just bear with me for a few minutes while I discuss the 8 formula that Stantec, the architectural firm, used to 10 come up with the height that they think they're allowed 11 to build on. 12 So I'm going to start off with a provocative question, and I'm going to end with two questions. 13 14 Would it be possible to build a tower with the height 15 of the Hancock Building in the Brookline M05 16 neighborhood, zoned for 35 feet? Could we see this 17 here? 18 Well, let's take a look. The MO5 allows 35 19 feet. This is a five-story building now on top of a 20 two-story parking garage. Entry to the garage at 21 Asheville Road is at street level. This is now seven 2.2 stories above street level, not five. And the building 23 height in the original proposal was 72 feet. Now it 24 will be 83 feet. Okay. And that's in the 35-foot

1 area. 2 So to look at the original plan -- again, we 3 haven't see the new plan -- we have now seven stories above the street level of Asheville Road; correct? 5 garage entry is on a level here. There are no ramps. This is not an underground garage. It's a garage that has been blasted out of the hillside here. It may be underground at this point, but it's not underground 8 here. And this is what it looks like. Again, we will 10 assume that there is another level up here making it seven stories above the ground level. 11 12 So how did they get this number? I'm going to show a blowup of this. This is in the original diagram 13 14 L104. It's on a handout. What they have done is gone 15 to a specific paragraph in the Brookline zoning regulations and then they've measured the distance from 16 17 here to one of the neighboring lots and used that as 18 their baseline for their calculations. 19 What they have done is to put this into a 20 pseudomathematical formula that says that their maximum 21 building height allowance is the mean natural grade of 22 the lowest abutting lot and -- and one-quarter of the 23 closest distance from the proposed building to the 24 lowest abutting lot plus the 35 feet that's allowed.

Is that what the Brookline zoning bylaws say? 1 2 The answer is absolutely not. 3 What the actual zoning laws say -- and I'm going to omit some of the original part of this in the 5 interest of height -- it says height shall be measured from a level not exceeding the mean grade of the lowest of any lot by more than one-quarter of the distance between the building and said abutting lot lines. So that's where they're getting this 25 percent figure 10 that they used, one-quarter. But look at the diagram that accompanies this. 11 The diagram is actually made to restrict the height of 12 a building on a hill, not to allow them to extend it. 13 14 What it's saying is that you take this distance from 15 the building to the abutting lots and you measure the distance one-quarter of the way from the building. 16 17 That's the baseline for the height. That's where you start the 35 feet; that you do not take this distance 18 19 and divide that by four. 20 So let's go back to their calculation box on 21 that diagram. It's a little bit hard to see, but trust 22 me, what they say is the maximum building height 23 allowance is 299 feet. Now, that's above sea level, so 24 the actual height from Asheville Road, which is at 156

- 1 feet, means that they can build, by their calculations,
- 2 143 feet above the mean natural grade. They could
- 3 build, by their calculations, a 14-story tower in this
- 4 building.
- 5 And the key here, again, is that distance.
- 6 They're taking that distance, dividing by 4, and adding
- 7 it to the 35 feet, as you can see in the calculation
- 8 box here. So in other words, the longer the distance
- 9 to the neighboring lot, the higher a building they can
- 10 build without limit, according to their calculations.
- 11 What does this mean? The bylaws limit the
- 12 height of a building at the top of a hill. Chestnut
- 13 Hill Realty chooses to believe that this allows them to
- build a 143-foot tower.
- So I'd like you to consider the following
- 16 hypothetical situation: Let's say we have a building
- 17 13A -- and I realize that's no longer the building
- 18 name. I don't know what it will be -- and let's say
- 19 it's in the MO5 area. Half a mile away, there is a lot
- 20 that is 1 foot lower. By their calculations, this
- would allow a building height of 2,640 divided by 4,
- 22 plus 35, the height allowed, minus 1 for the 1 foot
- lower, which would give you a building 694 feet high,
- 24 basically the height of the Hancock Tower. So if you

have that 2,640, divide it by 4, add 35 feet, you get 1 2 694. 3 Does anybody really believe that this is what Brookline zoning laws mean? Do we want to see a 5 building like that? At a certain private college, they could say, well, we've got the land here. We've got 7 2,640 feet. We can put up a tower of any height we 8 want. So I'm going to end with two questions: Does 10 anyone believe that this is what Brookline bylaws 11 intend? 12 And the second question, which is directed 13 specifically at the Board of Appeals: Does the Zoning 14 Board of Appeals want to establish this precedent of 15 unlimited building height in Brookline? Thank you. 16 MR. CHIUMENTI: Steve Chiumenti, 262 Russet 17 Road, Town Meeting member of Precinct 16. 18 Obviously, I haven't had time to spend time preparing, so I'll be very brief. First, obviously, we 19 20 don't even yet have exactly the details so we look 21 forward to having the opportunity to comment at some point in the further to the Board. 22 2.3 I quess my understanding is now this is the new plan? We're not considering two plans, we're not 24

arguing about plans, but this is going to be a plan 1 2 that is going to be the plan that we're going to be considering and no longer the old plan? 3 The problem is that obviously now we need to 5 begin reconsidering everything from scratch as far as our review of this thing, and I do appreciate that the Board realizes that this is a problem now for peer review that needs to be redone. And we're going to 8 look forward to all of that being redone from scratch 10 based on what now, I take it, the new plan. I don't quite know what the scope of a 11 preliminary eligibility letter is. It seems to be 12 pretty wide open, but this ranges pretty far from that. 13 14 I don't know at what point you would insist that someone go back to MassDevelopment and, frankly, get 15 the letter reissued, considering how different it is. 16 But consider that this now is a problem for 17 the Board as far as getting these peer reviews done. 18 19 And considering that this original plan appears to be 20 abandoned, I wonder if you would consider essentially 21 officially rejecting the existing proposal, 22 understanding that they're submitting a new one and 23 beginning the clock again. I don't understand why it 24 becomes a problem for you and the peer reviewers to

catch up with a last-minute change, a very late-in-the-1 program change of this drastic nature. 2 3 Now, let me just address the tower briefly. Basically, I was present at the hearing that Judge 5 Brady had on the case that's the Town of Brookline versus MassDevelopment. And that case -- one of the issues really is, what does "preliminary" mean in light of the subsequent regulations and so on. 8 But the point was, in discussing the meaning 10 of "preliminary," the attorney for MassDevelopment, Benjamin Tymann basically said to the judge that 11 MassDevelopment would approve and issue a preliminary 12 eligibility letter for any project that wasn't 13 14 ridiculous. 15 And that's kind of instructive because the fact of the matter is, the first proposal that CHR made 16 17 that had this five-story building on top of a two-story parking lot they were going to reject. So 18 19 MassDevelopment was prepared to say that that was 20 ridiculous. 21 In fact, in the letter that they had prepared 22 to send, that they were about to send before CHR timely 23 withdrew their request, one of the few things they actually mentioned being particularly persuasive was 24

the massing of the project's proposed five-story 1 2 building, which is inappropriate for the site, was one of the two or three factors they particularly pointed 3 to to reject the initial proposal. And it seems like 5 we've gone a little bit back to its original proposal in some respects with this thing. 7 I wonder whether this thing should be referred back to MassDevelopment for reconsideration given how 8 similar this is to what they were going to reject in 10 the first place. Whatever the one plan is, and I presume it's 11 going to be this new plan, we need to have time to do 12 the process we've all spent an enormous amount of time 13 14 and energy on so far. Thank you. 15 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Thank you. Before the next person speaks, if Sam Nagler 16 17 could speak to this issue about the issue of the modifications to the plan and the designated agency. 18 19 MR. NAGLER: The regulations are pretty clear 20 on this. Even if the comprehensive permit is issued, 21 nothing can be built under the comprehensive permit 22 unless the subsidizing agency gives its final approval, 23 and what they would approve is the actual plan. 24 So even though the Board does not have the

power or authority to demand that the applicant go back 1 2 to MassDevelopment, apparently they have already, which makes sense because they'd essentially be doing this at 3 their own risk if they just kind of proceeded and did 5 not go back to MassDevelopment and then at the end of the process alerted them to the change, sought final approval, and for some reason MassDevelopment didn't 7 8 approve it. So the bottom line is, the Board cannot force 10 the applicant to go back to MassDevelopment, but it's normally done and apparently it's being done in this 11 12 case. 13 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Thank you. 14 MS. LEICHTNER: I'm Judith Leichtner. I'm a 15 Town Meeting member from Precinct 16, and I'm at 121 16 Beverly Road. I'm not a direct abutter, just someone 17 who thinks that this process and all of this is just so 18 wrong and I'm trying to represent my neighborhood and 19 the comments that I've received. 20 It's difficult to really comment without lots 21 of time to process. I think this whole procedure of 22 this coming out as a secret and passing one piece of 23 paper is really quite reprehensible. I generally would 24 like to have time to be thoughtful and I'll try to make

sure to make sense, as I was jotting things down very 1 2 quickly. 3 I have a few questions. Ms. Steinfeld referred to this as the revised plan. The applicant refers to this as modifications under consideration. 5 So the question is, is this a new plan? Is this the plan that everyone is looking at? Is this what you're being asked to judge? Or if these are under consideration, are they going to say, oh, no, we don't 10 like this? And do something different. 11 I do have a question about Steve's point about 12 the fact that there should be more time to consider. 13 The fact that they're releasing this modification under 14 consideration this close to the deadline seems not only 15 unfair but unreasonable, and I think you should be asking for more. You should be asking for much more 16 17 time and give everyone, including the neighborhood and 18 anyone else who wants to look at this and all of the 19 people who have been working on this for over five 20 years, a chance to actually take a look. 21 The fact that -- because there was no 22 publication it was very difficult to get any 23 information out to the neighbors and to tell people to 24 show up from an unknown agenda. Although this isn't a

bad crowd, we know that many others wanted to attend 1 2 but 119 first graders at the Baker School put on their 3 play tonight and the parents were there. Note, I said 119 first graders. I know you can't consider schools, 5 but I think you have to know there are 119 first graders already enrolled. 7 I have some concerns about the fact that --8 this statement that it's better, and I'm fearing that the headline in the Tab will say "better plan 10 introduced" when I think it's only a different plan. Maybe by a strict definition of the word "better" maybe 11 12 we can say that, but a plan that goes from quite 13 horrendous to terrible, I still think it is pretty 14 lousy. 1.5 In 1946 the Town came up with a very good plan with the neighbors. With their ZBA, the town officials 16 17 and the developer came up with something that worked 18 and it worked for 68 years. They created 530 19 affordable units, not 36, 530 affordable units in an 20 area that had only contained a golf course and 21 single-family housing and it was one of the largest 22 developments in Brookline and it fit into the 23 neighborhood. 24 I know you have constraints but I still think

that this plan, which was designed to increase parking 1 2 and roads that Mr. Zuker has always said he wanted and destroying the greenbelt buffer to do it, that's what 3 this is about and I hope that you can do better. This plan requires, as you heard from your consultants, over 20,000 tons of removal of puddingstone rock, places this massive building on top of the highest point of the property, and that building is going to loom over everything else. And I'm not 10 going to go into the details, but it's going to change the visual landscape forever, and it has none of the 11 12 qualities that the original development -- what made it 13 so successful because they respected the landscaping, 14 they respected the environment, and they respected the 15 town and the neighborhood. 16 I also found that the comments about the 17 objectives of the Planning Department that 18 Ms. Steinfeld read and then the objectives that 19 Mr. Levin said to be really quite different. 20 Mr. Levin said that the Planning Department's 21 objectives were moving units from the S7 to the M5, 22 that the objectives of the Planning Department were removing a building. I don't think that's what the 23 24 Planning Department is telling us that were their

objectives. They said to retain useable open space. 1 2 I think much more could be done, because a 3 parking lot doesn't look to be like very useable open space. We got a lot of roads and parking. The 5 reduction of -- according to the Planning Department, the reduction of visual impact of the development on abutting single-family homes -- well, there's overwhelming visual impact. It's just incredible on 8 Russett Road. Their houses will change forever. 10 You're basically putting an Avalon Bay behind single-family homes, and that is a change that is 11 12 incredibly out of proportion. Four stories was 13 terrible, five stories is worse. And as Steve said, 14 MassDevelopment said that was a reason for denial. 15 And, you know, again, we know it's not part of the 40B, but Planning said they wanted to minimize the 16 impact on the schools, but 184 units will bring in 17 18 hundreds of new kids. And Alan Morris, who you heard 19 from who was the former chair of the school committee, 20 said even with 80 less bedrooms, people in Brookline 21 put children into hallways, into dining rooms, anyplace 22 They put the cots on the floor. And so this 23 will bring in hundreds of new kids. Remember there are 24 already 119 first graders.

I hope that the ZBA and the Town realize this 1 and insist that we do better than this. I hope this 2 will try to ensure that any project like this will be 3 as successful as the original project that the Town and 5 the developer agreed to so many years ago. And I know you're really busy, and I 7 appreciate all that you do, but I'm going to ask you to do one more thing. I would ask this board to have one more tour of this site. The last visit you had was on 10 the coldest day of the year. It was ridiculous. 11 property was frozen and it was barren. And I ask you to request that CHR mark this proposal on the site and 12 13 when you look at it, you'll see the hills, the trees, 14 and the grass when they're green, and you can fully 15 appreciate what's going to be destroyed. I believe we 16 can do better. I hope that the Town will do better. 17 And just as an aside, they have an awful lot of land and they are insisting on this spot and, again, 18 I think that's reprehensible. 19 20 MR. KING: My name is David King. 21 resident of Mason Terrace in North Brookline and vice 2.2 chair of the Preservation Commission and a member of 23 the Hancock Village Neighborhood Conservation 24 District.

```
In our Preservation Commission, part of our
 1
      work is to protect cultural resources and as you're
 2
      aware, the commission has identified Hancock Village as
 3
      a significant cultural asset in Brookline. It's also
      been voted eligible for the national register and state
 5
      register of historic places. I think the history of
      the development had been described to you, but I would
      reiterate that it is the largest and most significant
 8
      garden village housing development in the region.
10
               One extraordinary aspect of the original
      development is the design of the stipulation through
11
12
      the project and the resulting hierarchy of spaces.
13
      Cars moved from the major roads like Independence to
14
      smaller roads like Thornton and residents could not
15
      walk to their apartment. And the building themselves
      separated a popular vehicular area from a calmer semi-
16
17
     private parking are on the other side. These
      relationships of public to private, vehicular to
18
19
     pedestrians, are fundamental to the original designed
20
      and they are turned upside down in this proposal.
21
               The greenbelt, which is the garden semiprivate
22
      areas in many of these apartments and is also an area
23
      for community events and a significant natural resource
      of the development, is flattened and paved over for the
24
```

parking and vehicular traffic just like the area on the 1 2 other side of the building. The new buildings, and especially the new 3 parking are unrelated to the original design concept. 5 Although the density of the development may have changed in the new proposal, the basic design is the The apartment building has gotten higher, and the shape has no relation to the original layout of the townhouses around it. It seems like a building 10 designed for another setting. The concern regarding the extraordinary amount of excavation that will be 11 12 required for building are unchanged. 13 I think, speaking for both commissions, we 14 would like to be involved in the discussions with the 15 architectural peer review of the project. Clearly, the 16 town wants affordable housing, but I believe both 17 commissions are convinced that a more appropriate plan could be developed that would better compliment the 18 19 qualities of Hancock Village. Thank you. 2.0 MR. GLADSTONE: Hi. Scott Gladstone, 21 383 Russett Road, Town Meeting member from Precinct 16 22 but speaking for myself tonight. 2.3 I'd love to have a picture of the revised site

plan put up actually in front of me, but the last time

24

I asked for that I was told no, so I want to save Joe 1 2 and the developers the embarrassment of telling me no, so I won't ask for that. We'll have to use our 3 imagination. 5 A couple people have mentioned that we can't consider school population, but I actually remember a 7 very interesting comment from the chair of the school committee, and I've heard this elsewhere, and maybe 8 counsel can help us out; that while financial impact 10 can't be considered on things like schools, when there is a master plan that's being put into effect to 11 12 address structural issues in the town and the 13 development is going to negatively impact that master 14 plan, then that is a relevant consideration. 15 And I would ask you to investigate that because we absolutely have a master plan in place to 16 17 deal with our exploding population problem. This last 18 Town Meeting, of which I'm a member, we borrowed a 19 million dollars to have a feasibility study of growth 20 in place with the Driscoll School because that was the 21 plan. The plan was that it was not an appropriate 22 place for a K through 8 school. The solution, 23 therefore, is to plan out and expand in place. 24 Similarly, there's already in the works a plan

to expand the Lawrence School, and I believe we voted 1 a -- some debt authorization for about \$2.5 million to 2. 3 cover the expanding cost of that. So there is a master plan in place and we're 5 actively pursuing it by funding it and hiring design professionals to pursue it. And if this is going to 7 compromise that, I suggest that is something that you 8 could consider. I would ask you to research that issue. 10 Some of the revised plans, which I think is the beginning of a positive conversation but not the 11 12 end of the conversation, is reminiscent, however, of 13 some of the things that we were a little bit concerned 14 about with respect to what we were looking at a couple 15 of years ago when we had the Hancock Village Planning 16 Committee. 17 We were told that there were going to be a number of one-bedrooms but as we recall, those were 18 19 extremely large one-bedrooms. They were sort of 20 pushing the square footage of my house, which is sort 21 of a three-bedroom. It's a three-bedroom, sort of a 22 four-bedroom. The issue was being able to just put a 23 heck of a lot of people in that space.

We also heard about lofts a couple of years

24

ago. We had the same concern that these were 1 2 essentially going to be bedrooms for small children, 3 and that's one of the things we were trying to work with the developer to try to minimize as much as 5 possible. Now we're hearing that familiar issue again, and we have the same concerns. I have a question. I hope you ask it. seems to me that the revised site plan does go beyond 8 the boundaries of this lot that they carved out to 10 lease to the Residents of South Brookline entity. If that's the case, in order to accommodate moving one of 11 12 the buildings off of the greenbelt that's associated 13 with Beverly more inward to the site, then I would 14 suggest that goes to something that I talked about when 15 the public first had a chance to comment, and 16 reflecting a little bit of what Judith was saying, that 17 there are more appropriate places on the site for some 18 of these buildings. So if they could be expanding this 19 lot even a little bit, then the suggestion really is 20 that they really could use that flexibility to expand 21 it or change it in other ways that are much more 22 appropriate. 2.3 I would like to see, rather than one building 24 moved to infill, the horseshoe buildings on the west

- 1 side of the project, I'd like to see all of those
- 2 horseshoes filled in rather than there being massing.
- 3 And if you could have it up, I could even walk over and
- 4 show you what I'm talking, about.
- 5 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Can you put up the
- 6 picture, please.
- 7 MR. GLADSTONE: Thank you. I appreciate
- 8 that.
- 9 So what I'm talking about is this infill
- 10 here. Now, I proposed that as a way to address some of
- 11 these concerns earlier. So then why cannot this
- 12 building be pulled down to infill here, that building
- 13 can pull down and infill here, the building that is
- 14 blocking everyone's view of the green way from the
- major artery could be pulled to fill in there.
- Now, similarly, if you put parking underneath
- 17 those buildings, as they are proposing that they have
- 18 to do in the large apartment building, we could
- 19 eliminate the parking on the access road and make that
- 20 much, much narrower and preserve much more of that
- 21 green alleyway for the site line all the way through.
- 22 Wouldn't that be a nice improvement? And they wouldn't
- even lose any units that way.
- Now, the other issue somebody mentioned -- I

think it was Judy saying that all of this parking 1 2 doesn't feel like usable open space. In fact, as you all know, the definition of both landscaped open space 3 and useable open space in our bylaw excludes anything 5 that's designed for parking, so none of that is open space. You really need greenery, you need landscaping, and the more that that can be improved, the more that genuinely would be a benefit and a real improvement to the project. 10 The apartment building: So just from my view also, I was really hoping that if they were going to 11 12 have a large massing, that they put it where we were 13 first talking about, when we first were looking at this 14 in 2011, which is, they weren't going to take this down 15 and put something here. But even if they don't want to 16 lose housing, if we're going to remove some trees, 17 let's remove some trees in here and we have a nice access from the major artery. It's a much more 18 19 appropriate place for massing. It's much further away 20 from the F7 area and the existing single-family homes, 21 and because the topography is going to be much less. So, again, I would ask you, could you find out 22 23 whether this building, in fact, is beyond the current lot lines that they've constructed because if it is 24

over even an inch, that suggests to me that there is 1 some flexibility there. It makes no sense to me anyway 2. whether or not that's true, that there isn't some 3 flexibility, but I hope there is. 5 Also, again, not sure if this is appropriate but I would ask you to ask. Whatever is green at the end of the day, could there be a preservation easement as a requirement of the conditions so that we're not coming back here and doing this again? If we're 10 talking about how to balance the lot or how to unbalance the lot in the least egregious way, let's do 11 12 it once. And if that's what we all agree on, let's not have an opportunity for it to be out of balance again. 13 14 So any green space, you know, can you ask for 15 a preservation easement? If this has to stay green now because that's going to stay there, let's keep that 16 17 green. Let's not create another opportunity for something to once again throw this site even more out 18 of balance. 19 The access to the VFW: If that were there --2.0 21 and I've heard this bandied about before -- then this 22 access to Asheville, which everyone is -- I'm glad to 23 hear, is of concern because of the traffic going up 24 really all the side streets but in particular, I think,

Russett Road because that's where the traffic control 1 2 light is that governs where all the children are 3 walking across to go to the Baker School. If we have an access here, there is the possibility, and probably 5 a smart one, to make this only an emergency access like they supposedly have up here at -- what is it 7 Thornton -- Grassmere. 8 And when we were up there for that really cold day, everyone remembers famously that FedEx truck that 10 just went over the little bumps. So that wasn't a very effective stop. Although now, to the developers' 11 12 credit, they do have plastic barriers which are easily 13 pushed aside by a fire truck and probably does dissuade 14 cars and delivery trucks. If something similar could 15 happen here, that would be tremendously helpful for the 16 traffic. 17 However, I hope that everyone was listening very, very carefully when the developer talked about --18 19 answered your question: Well, what exactly do you mean 20 about when you're going to apply for the application 21 for that curb cut? 22 And I hope you were listening carefully. I'm 23 sure you were. I certainly was. The answer was: 24 the ZBA approves the project with conditions that are

sufficiently doable in the minds of the developer, only 1 2 then, after the approvals will they make the 3 application. However, if, in their mind, the approval is 5 too onerous for them or they get a denial -- well, of course, if they get a denial, they wouldn't have a reason to do the curb cut. That would be okay too. But if there was an approval with conditions and it's not to their liking such that they have to go to court, 10 all bets are off. There's no curb cut in the VFW. Now, if they really want to make this work, 11 make this okay for the town and the neighborhood, why 12 13 wouldn't they make that part of the plan now. 14 Of course, if they don't get it, if they get 15 it turned down after pursuing in good faith, you know, we can make accommodations for that in the condition. 16 But to not make a condition or to not even agree that 17 18 it should be a condition that they make their best 19 efforts as part of the approval seems to me very 20 cynical and really too bad. 21 And, you know, they -- I know a lot of people 22 think that they're threatening and they're holding 23 things over our heads. This is the first time we've 24 actually heard them utter an "If not this, then not

```
this." This is a you-rub-my-back, I-rub-your-back quid
 1
 2
      pro quo. They don't have to do that, and I wish they
      wouldn't.
 3
               Like I said, I like that there's more green
 5
      space; I like that there are some things smaller; I
      don't like that some things are larger. It is a good
      start of a conversation. Unfortunately, there hasn't
      been any conversation. There's been a take it or leave
 8
      it.
10
               Now they say, okay, well, we're listening.
      Take or leave this one. But they're not even saying
11
12
      take it, because they're not even sure they're giving
13
      it. It depends on how tonight goes, if they get enough
14
      feel good, ra, ra, ra.
15
               That doesn't feel like a conversation to me.
      If we had a conversation, maybe we could get
16
17
      somewhere. Thank you.
18
19
               MS. SCHARF: Hi. My name is Irene Scharf.
20
      live at 250 Russett Road. I'm an abutter and a
21
      Precinct 16 Town Meeting member.
22
               My comments are not going to be coherent,
23
      because I've been taking a lot of notes for the last
24
      couple of hours because while some people had this plan
```

before, the neighbors didn't. And so I really think 1 2 it's ridiculous and premature for me to try to opine on the various aspects of the so-called conceived 3 modifications or whatever that is. And I guess that 5 really makes my first point. I will try only to repeat if I'm saying 7 something differently than one of the other speakers. I do agree with many of the things that the prior 8 speakers agree with, although I'm not as optimistic as 10 Scott is that we could sit down with this developer and come up with something that would be appropriate for 11 12 the town because of our five-and-a-half-year history 13 with all of this. 14 I'm a law professor -- fundamental fairness, 15 due process. We're talking about serious property rights; we're talking about serious rights of a town. 16 17 It's objectionable, to say it mildly, that we are asked 18 to come here tonight with an agenda about a day old on 19 a horrible rainy day with some very elderly people in 20 the neighborhood who do try and come to the meetings 21 when they can and it's impressive that so many have 22 come. 23 But to say we will now have our opportunity to 24 comment, that's cynical. That is really cynical.

need time to look at this. We haven't seen it. 1 2 piece of paper was passed around the audience. It's 3 objectionable. And I understand that apparently this board has relatively little power according to the 40B 5 law, but there are some powers that this board has and I, like Judy, would ask you to exercise them. 7 I don't quite understand what Attorney Nagler 8 explained. I am a law professor, so maybe I might understand it better than some people in the audience 10 who aren't. I think -- if I understand what he said, I think I disagree. As I said, I'm not sure I know what 11 12 he said. 13 760 Code of Mass regulations 56.04 are the 14 regs concerning substantial change from a plan. If you 15 look at paragraph 5, it explains -- and I won't quote it all but I would point it out to you and I'm actually 16 17 surprised that it did not come up in your conversation 18 tonight -- "If an applicant desires to change access of 19 a proposal that would affect the project's eligibility 20 requirements set forth in 760 CMR 56.041, it shall 21 notify the subsidizing agency in writing of such 22 changes with a copy to the department, chief executive 23 officer of the municipality, and the Board. subsidizing agency shall, within 15 days" -- blah, 24

- 1 blah, blah.
- 2 If you go back to paragraph 1, it refers to
- 3 all of the project eligibility requirements, findings
- 4 in determination that come up in 760 CMR 56.04,
- 5 paragraph 4.
- 6 So the attorney for the developer said -- and
- 7 I appreciate that Mr. Geller acknowledged that there is
- 8 a lot of information here, and there is. And then the
- 9 attorney said, we ran these modifications with
- 10 MassDevelopment and they were received very
- 11 positively. That's not -- we don't have much to go by
- 12 here, but we have something. And we are asking you to
- do what you can with what you have.
- So that's my new point that I'm making and I
- will try to add something to some of the other comments
- 16 others have made.
- This is either a minor tweak, in which case it
- 18 can't address the major concerns that have arisen over
- 19 the last several months, or it's a substantial change
- and MassDevelopment needs to be given the new plan or
- 21 whatever it's called and make its approval or rejection
- or whatever it's going to be. And no doubt it would
- 23 address the five-story, really seven-story building
- 24 about which it was about to reject the proposal a year

```
and a half ago.
 1
 2
               So is it is, or is it ain't? It's one thing
 3
      or another. We have this new plan, or we may have part
      of a new plan, or we don't have this full new plan --
      because we don't -- and we're rejecting this prior
 5
      plan. We the neighbors, we the people in Brookline
      don't know. And to wait until tonight when the peer
      reviewer has apparently less than two weeks from this
      date to have a final report to you, and to consider
10
      expecting that what is due from the very well-financed
11
      developer a delay from the model that is due tomorrow,
12
      that is not doing all you can do with what you have,
13
      the little you have.
14
               I don't want to anger you. I don't want to be
15
      disrespectful. Just like everyone else, I respect all
      the time and the work and you're volunteers and I get
16
17
      that. I do that too. But you really have an
      obligation to do for us what you do have the power to
18
19
      do, and I'm asking to you to take this far more
20
      seriously than just coming in here, passing around a
21
      piece of paper, and telling us this is our chance to
22
      have public comments. And considering expecting a
23
      delay when your -- when our peer reviewer needs to do
24
      work on this serious, major project, I'm really
```

shocked. I'm really, really disappointed. 1 2 So I also want to remind you that in prior years CHR was in the driver's seat. They would wait 3 until early August. They would submit a proposal. We 5 would all be on vacation, if we were lucky, kids going back to school, and we'd have to scurry around the neighborhood and try and get people to read the 8 proposal and comment and be here and show up for all the meetings. 10 Right now, you can be more in the driver's seat, and I would ask again that you put yourself there 11 12 and do what you can do. This is a -- either it's not a 13 substantial change, in which case it doesn't address 14 the serious issues, or if it is, you need to use the 15 law that you do have in your favor. 16 I do also question the penultimate sentence of 17 the planning director's statement in which she said 18 that it's the professional opinion of the town staff. 19 It wasn't a negotiation, although one of our ZBA 20 members actually used your word "negotiation" and, of 21 course, was then corrected. They were not authorized 22 to negotiate. But it was the professional opinion of the town staff. I don't know what that is if it's not 23 24 a negotiation.

```
So I'm now going to look down. I hope you can
 1
 2
      bear with me because I have taken a lot of notes but
      some of my neighbors have mentioned some of the
 3
      things.
 5
               Initially, this was all about parking.
      developer has wanted to put parking lots and roads on
 7
      the green space for probably now more than 20 years;
      succeeded, we don't really know how, in getting a
 8
      public driveway cracked in the road on Independence --
10
      actually, I think I have -- it moved into the
      neighborhood in the late '80s, I think -- and was
11
12
      never, apparently, able to do anything with that.
13
      the start, this was paving over paradise to put up a
14
      parking lot, and that's what we're getting if we're
15
      getting this new site plan.
16
               So as Scott said -- and I do agree with him on
17
      most things -- there are so many things that are
18
      reminiscent of projects -- I was on the Hancock Village
19
      Planning Committee as well, five years ago.
20
      so many things here that are reminiscent of issues we
21
      studied in depth. And we wrote a report, and the
22
      selectmen unanimously agreed with that report -- that
23
      they're throwing it at you at the last minute when
24
      you're under the gun, that's crazy. You're not under
```

```
the gun. You've got to put them under the gun.
 1
 2
               So let's see if I have anything else that has
      not been mentioned.
 3
               The VFW exit, I don't know. I don't know
 5
      anything about that kind of thing. It's the state
      that's going to have the right to -- I appreciate the
      thought that it could be a possibility, but it's
      probably a pretty dangerous possibility. I have no
 8
      idea. I don't know anything about it or any of those
10
      people. I can't imagine that that would be allowed.
11
      I'd love it if it would be allowed, if it would be
12
      safe, but I really can't imagine that that's going to
13
      be a resolution of anything.
14
               So for you all to be negotiating with them to
      give us a comprehensive permit and then, as Scott said,
15
16
      we will go look for this, which is highly unlikely to
      happen, I think, I think you all might want to have
17
18
      some of your experts check out the likelihood of that
19
      happening. And certainly to issue a comprehensive plan
20
      when a major aspect of the objection of the safety
21
      experts and all are addressed by that afterwards, if
      that's not a negotiation, again, I don't know what is.
22
23
               The lot line -- I was always curious when
24
      sitting in these meetings that CHR's representative
```

would talk about, well, we can't move the lot line. 1 2 That would move the lot line. Again, is it is, or is it ain't? You can move the lot line, or you can't move 3 the lot line? Now they can move the lot line where they want to, but when others suggest that if they move the lot line, there would be places to put maybe a taller building toward the back of the side or whatever, they 8 can't move the lot line. So if they're moving a lot 10 line, that seems to be a substantial change satisfying at least one of the paragraphs in the CMR that I cited. 11 12 Let's see. A couple of other things. This whole question about this -- if you give us the 13 14 comprehensive plan now, we will go and try to get the 15 curb cut. What else that they have not committed to --I've been standing here before. I'm saying the slide 16 17 said "may," and the lawyer said "will." And what's in writing, you know, definitely trumps what the person 18 said. I pointed this out before. The commitments need 19 20 to be conditions, I guess, if you're considering that. 21 But whether they will do this, again, I think you should expect that they will. You may be out of the 22 23 process by that point, but we won't be. 24 And finally, a suggestion for someone -- I was

being passed papers as I was standing in line and one 1 2 suggests that the -- there are a highly underused garages that are on Independence Drive. I think 3 there's two. They're underground garages. That's 5 already a built-up site. They're hardly used. I don't know that CHR is getting substantial funds from that. Why can't that not be a small two-story or something? I'm not going to propose suggestions on design, but why 8 can't that be used to build some other apartment and 10 get rid of this tower or massive Avalon or whatever you're going to call it? 11 12 So there are other things that I don't know 13 why they haven't considered. Maybe they have. None of 14 the representatives of the community were allowed to be present during these, quote, working sessions, so I 15 16 don't know what was discussed. But I certainly do hope 17 that you take some power back and do what you can to 18 help us in the neighborhood, help us in Brookline, 19 because as we all know, this is going to have a 2.0 substantial effect on the town. It already costs us 21 over a million dollars a year, and I really ask you to 22 take some power back and do what you can to help us. 23 MS. DEWITT: My name is Betsy DeWitt. I'm a 24 member of the Board of Selectmen, and I'm speaking on

behalf of myself. I live at 94 Upland Road in 1 2 Brookline. 3 The board is on record as opposing the original application under Chapter 40B for a 5 comprehensive permit for residential units at Hancock Village, and the board has not endorsed this last-minute revised proposal that appears to use lot lines that we were previously told were immovable. 8 This revised proposal has all the same defects 10 as the original. The applicant has chosen the worst location in the entire property to build new 11 12 construction. This version has the same overall site 13 plan that eliminates the greenbelt buffer that's a 14 significant part of the historic Hancock Village 15 planned garden community. The proposed building 16 locations are not on underutilized or vacant land. 17 They're on the greenbelt. The greenbelt and 18 puddingstone outcropping on which the applicant 19 proposes to build was originally designed to and still 20 does serve as community parkland for residents who have 21 no private outdoor space. 22 Further, this revision adds a fifth floor to a 23 totally out-of-scale multiunit building found on the 24 highest point of the site giving it the massing and

appearance of an eight-story building towering over the 1 2 entire neighborhood of one- and two-story homes. proposal actually covers more of the greenbelt land for 3 parking than the previous proposal. Where are children 5 able to play soccer in this, quote, usable open space? Although the number of bedrooms is reduced, we 7 know "loft" is a euphemism for sleeping space, also known as a bedroom. 8 Continuing to totally ignore the 10 characteristics that were implemented in the original Hancock Village garden community design by the 11 12 Frederick Law Olmstead firm with significant areas of 13 open space, preservation of natural resources 14 integrated into the site plan with separation of 15 pedestrian and vehicular uses, this development is not 16 in harmony with Hancock Village as it currently exists or with the neighboring single-family residences. 17 And now we're to understand there will be a 18 19 hurried and unlikely to be thorough peer review of this 20 substantially changed project of both architecture and 21 site design. 2.2 Hancock Village has been determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places and is 23 subject, therefore, to review under the Mass 24

Environmental Policy Act by the Massachusetts Historic 1 2 Commission. I quote, any new construction project or renovations to existing buildings that require funding, 3 licenses, or permits from any state or governmental 5 agencies must be reviewed by the Massachusetts Historical Commission for impact to historic and archeological properties. In the words of the original eligibility 8 denial letter from MassDevelopment that was 10 mysteriously withdrawn, the words continue to be applicable. It is, quote, not suitable due to the 11 12 project's complete elimination of the existing 13 greenbelt buffer between the current Hancock Village 14 residences and abutting single-family neighborhood 15 homes and the massing of the project's proposed five-story building, which is generally inappropriate 16 for the site and not well mitigated by topography or 17 other means. As a result, the proposed design should 18 19 not be built. It actually says it's generally not 20 appropriate. 21 According to the state's own guidelines, this 22 proposed project was not appropriate in February of 2013 and it's still not appropriate in June of 2014. 23 24 How can an inappropriate, badly conceived project,

- revised but with all the same deficits and fewer
 affordable units -- that's what 40B's supposed to be
- 3 all about. What hypocrisy. How can this be considered
- 4 better? The town deserves better, and I ask the Board
- 5 of Appeals to demand better.
- 6 MS. DALY: Hi. I'm Nancy Daly. I'm a member
- of the Board of Selectmen. I live at 161 Russett Road,
- 8 and I am speaking for myself because this plan has not
- 9 been on the Board's agenda.
- I want to say I am happy to see we're having a
- discussion about retaining more trees and reducing the
- 12 number of bedrooms. I still have a number of serious
- 13 concerns about the project.
- One, the massing of the apartment building.
- 15 Secondly the lofts. I too agree, I think that lofts
- are going to be used as bedrooms. And while I
- 17 appreciate that you can't discuss the number of kids
- 18 going to the nearby school, I think that the density of
- 19 this project, vis-a-vis the density and the surrounding
- 20 single-family neighborhood is an appropriate subject
- 21 for discussion for the ZBA and I ask you to consider
- 22 that.
- In addition, I am very concerned about traffic
- 24 going onto these neighboring streets. There are a lot

of kids in those houses on those streets, kids walking 1 up to the school up at the top of the hill there, and I 2 3 think this is going to put a tremendous strain on those neighborhood streets. 5 And finally, I want to say that in terms of the parking there that is in the greenbelt, I'm happy to see the garage is gone. But I want to say that when you're doing a 40B and you're allowed to override all 8 of our local zoning constraints, you do not have to 10 meet our zoning parking requirement. You can have less 11 parking. 12 We just had a vigorous debate at Town Meeting about the Brookline Place project, and the zoning that 13 14 was on the warrant was considerably less than what is 15 in our zoning code. And people were discussing issues of climate change and concern for the environment and 16 17 that it's time that we start thinking about zoning that demands management transportation plans and ways to 18 19 reduce parking. And I would ask you to consider that 20 on this occasion to save more of that open space. 21 And finally, I just want to echo what many of 22 the neighbors have said. I think after people have had 23 an opportunity to really take a look at this and digest 24 it, you need to have another public hearing and an

opportunity for people to respond after they've had a 1 2 chance to really dig in a little bit. Thank you. MR. PU: Hi. I'm Bill Pu. I'm an abutter at 3 249 Beverly Road, and I'm also a Town Meeting member of 5 Precinct 16. So I just wanted to echo what Irene said about 7 this procedural level. I think the way that this plan 8 is being introduced is just -- it's beyond words that, you know, they had this plan, we heard last week, maybe 10 they're going to present it, maybe not, we don't know. And only a few days ago we were told for sure that 11 12 modifications would be presented. 13 How can we really mobilize a neighborhood 14 response or engage our lawyer to come on such short 15 notice? The ZBA does have many limitations in these procedures, but it can dictate the agenda. And I think 16 17 that the leeway given here on the agenda, not knowing 18 the agenda until three days before the meeting, is 19 something that should not be allowed. 2.0 There's been some modifications on this plan, 21 but I think if you start with something really bad and 22 you just tweak it, you can't come out with something 23 good. So this started from an F and it may be an 24 F-plus, but it's still and F. And I don't think we

should -- you know, maybe we can give them a pat on the 1 2 back for getting the plus, but it's still an F. fundamental flaws have not changed. And, you know, if 3 you're just going to tweak something that's bad, it's 5 not going to get good. I also wanted to echo, just from a practical 7 standpoint, we need to know what we're talking about. 8 So are we talking about this plan, or are we talking about a different plan? I don't know in what way it's 10 done, but the ZBA needs to require that the developer say, this is my plan, Plan A or Plan B. Not, this is 11 proposed modifications for consideration. Let's see 12 13 what you think. Maybe you'll like it, but then if I 14 don't get what I want, I'm going to withdraw it. It's 15 got to be, you go with this plan or that plan, but we can't have a bait and switch or a, you know, you like 16 17 this plan but I'm not getting what I want so I'm going to go back to my old plan. We can't have that. 18 19 Regarding the specifics of the plan, of course 20 we haven't had a chance to really review it, but I just 21 would like to mention a few things. 22 The current Hancock Village is the largest 23 development in Brookline's history. It has 843 24 bedrooms according to our figures. This plan was

reduced from 402 bedrooms to 314 bedrooms. In other 1 2 words, it's a 40 percent expansion of the largest development in Brookline's history. It might sound 3 like maybe the number of units is not that high, but the fact is it's 314 bedrooms. 5 Now, I want to point out on the west side we 7 have this enormous road. How many units are being served by this road? It looks to me like 12. 8 would build a road over all of that green space to 10 serve 12 units. That just doesn't seem like -- if you were an architecture student, you would not do this. 11 12 Why do you do this? 13 It's obviously the parking. Why does less 14 units need more parking? It's because they want 15 parking. Why do they want parking? They've always wanted parking for these units. That's been the 16 17 constant theme of these plans. So I don't know how it 18 can be done but, of course, these parking are supposed 19 to serve these units. But of course, once it's built 20 how are you going to restrict that? The use of the new 21 features of the development should not be used to serve 22 the existing units, since it's supposed to be part of 23 an affordable housing development, but obviously that

is the intent.

24

```
About the five-story apartment building, I
 1
      just want to reiterate that that's the -- one of the
 2
 3
      few things in the MassDevelopment denial letter that
      was not sent was the specific comment that the
      five-story building was inappropriate, and here we have
      the five-story building again.
 7
               And just -- I think this possibility of
 8
      changing the lot lines that's now come up -- before it
      was just off the table. Now it seems like maybe we can
10
      change the lot lines. So I think now that that's a
11
      possibility, maybe we need to just start from the
12
      beginning and rethink what is possible if you could,
13
      for example, put a building here or something like
14
      that. Why put the building in the worst place
15
      possible? And then why start to make tweaks to the
      worst possible design? You should start from a better
16
17
      design and then make tweaks to that.
18
               And lastly, just about the design, just to
19
      reiterate about this VFW access, I think that the
20
      likelihood of that is extremely low and either you
21
      should not factor that at all in your deliberations or
22
      you should make that a precondition to -- if it really
      is an important factor in your decision making, that
23
24
      should be a condition of the building. It should not
```

be that you approve it and then maybe they'll apply or 1 2 they will apply but it probably will get denied; then it should not have been considered in your 3 deliberations because the likelihood is so low that it 5 will get approved. We've heard from the Preservation Commission 7 about this being an historic property. Mass Historical 8 Society still has not provided input or review about this property and so I'm -- I don't really know the 10 rules, but how can we get them involved? Is there a 11 way the ZBA can trigger a review? Is it possible that 12 the reason this VFW access was not requested is because 13 that might trigger an MHC review? So just I'm asking, 14 what can the ZBA do to involve Mass Historic? 15 And finally, I just want to reiterate a point that Scott made that I think that anything that's built 16 17 here should only be built on the precondition that 18 there's no further development; that whatever you 19 approve should come with the condition that that's the 20 last development that will be permitted on this 21 property. Because that was actually -- or that the 22 development should meet the initial agreement that was 2.3 made in 1946. 24 Because that was the clear intent of the

- original construction, and this is a perversion of that
- 2 agreement which is still being challenged in court.
- 3 And I think that they should be made to live to the
- 4 letter of the agreement that was originally established
- 5 and has been so successful for all these years. Thank
- 6 you.
- 7 MS. JONAS: Hi. Alisa Jonas, Precinct 16 Town
- 8 Meeting member. I'm also kind of all over the place
- 9 and I've heard a lot of things that other people have
- 10 said that I would have said. I also somewhat want to
- 11 echo Irene but say it somewhat differently.
- 12 I feel very demoralized. I feel that there is
- 13 an unequal balance between the public and a developer
- 14 when it comes to the town and when it comes to the
- 15 state. There are so many conflicts. We have the
- 16 former chair of the selectmen who represents the
- 17 developer; we have someone on the MassDevelopment who
- 18 is in the same law firm as Chestnut Hill Realty; we
- 19 have -- I'm blanking out.
- 20 And I feel like there's a level of respect
- 21 that is given a developer and it is not given to the
- 22 public. When there are people in the public that
- 23 misbehave in front of a board, I have seen the board
- 24 scold them.

```
We have a situation here with the lot lines
 1
      that people have brought up over and over again.
 2
      was the Planning Board and the Zoning Board of Appeals,
 3
      both of whom asked the developer, why don't you place
 5
      this development in a better location? And to both the
      Planning Board and to you, the attorney for the
      developer said, we cannot change the lot lines. This
      is our 40B. And now in this proposal, as everyone
      knows, they have changed the lot lines. Suddenly they
10
      have something in the middle of their units.
11
               Why haven't you brought that up? Why haven't
      you questioned them? Why haven't you said, wait a
12
13
      second. You said this and now you're saying this.
14
      Either legally you can do one thing or another. And we
15
      sit here and we're just flabbergasted that over and
      over again a developer can make misrepresentations and
16
      they are not questioned by the officials who are
17
18
      reviewing them and it's very unsettling.
19
               The green space buffer zone, I know,
20
      Mr. Geller, you had said that that wasn't so important
21
      for you to feel that it should be preserved, but for
22
      the neighborhood and for the people who live in that
23
      apartment complex, it's very important. It's one of
      the most beautiful spaces. It's very visible from the
24
```

I've spoken to a lot the people who live in 1 2 those apartment buildings -- my mother used to live there -- and they told me that they love using that 3 space and that that's the reason they moved in. 5 So it isn't something to take lightly and it is something that was made as a commitment to the 7 neighborhood. It has changed from building this massive development. It's the largest development that 8 has ever been built in Brookline. So I don't 10 understand why this buffer zone is not taken seriously when even the 40B regulations say greenbelt buffer 11 12 zones are acceptable -- if you read the regs -- and 13 that's why it was denied before it was approved. 14 So I would hope that you would also consider 15 the people who live in that development and the 16 neighborhood and the people who support green space 17 like the Brookline Green Space Alliance who are very 18 concerned about the green belt. 19 And given that, it seems to me -- and since we haven't yet heard why lot lines can't be changed -- it 20 21 seems they've got the hat out of the box, or whatever 22 the expression is -- now they can locate their units in 23 one of the ugly garages. 24 I also am wondering about the retaining

walls. They went from three to one. Do they need 1 2 retaining walls, or was that just a bogeyman to eliminate so that we can think it's a better project? 3 I'd like someone to explain that to me. 5 Traffic calming, I have heard that we now have plans for traffic calming measures. The issue isn't 6 7 the calming, the speed, it's the volume. We have small streets. The increase in traffic based on CHR's own 8 consultant is that it goes up by 80 percent. Is that 10 appropriate? It doesn't matter whether they're going five miles an hour or fifty. So traffic calming is not 11 12 the issue. 13 Which leads me to another problem, which is 14 peer review. Peer review can only look at the 15 information that the CHR consultants have chosen to 16 take and analyze. 17 So, for example, the borings that were done in 18 February to see if there was water. Of course they didn't find water because it was frozen. It was a very 19 20 cold day. If the neighborhood had not come up -- if 21 some of our neighbors hadn't been running around 22 noticing what they were doing, we wouldn't have even 23 known that that's when the borings were done. It was 24 up to us, the neighbors, over and over again to find

the flaws and bring them out. 1 And peer review, they would have just looked 2 3 at the borings and made an assessment, but our neighbors said, look, you can't look in February. You 5 have to look in April. And I'd like to actually know what the outcome was of the borings in April. Have they been done? The other thing is, again, with the bedrooms. I know there's a decrease in bedroom units. What I'd 10 like to know is, is the decrease the change in the 11 square footage among the apartments? We were also told 12 that the acreage that they've now kept as green space 13 is three acres, but what was it before? What is the 14 difference between the old model and the new model? 15 The neighborhood conservation district, the fact that it is one, has that been considered at all by 16 17 you in private meetings? I know the problem might be 18 considered. There might be a thought to, oh, well, 19 it's not something that 80 percent of the populous voted on in that area, but I think that particular kind 20 21 of neighborhood conservation district is like the 22 landmark in Cambridge. It should have been labeled 23 "landmark" and that's some kind of adjustment that we 24 should be making in the law.

But what role does that play in the design as 1 There are ways of development in that unit that 2 also match the characteristics that are required under 3 the neighborhood conservation district requirements, 5 and I'm wondering if that's something you've looked at yet. 7 I'm also wondering why the agreement that they were aware of -- that is being addressed in the 8 lawsuit, but I would like to know whether any of you 10 have looked at that and made your own assessment of whether you think that's an important criteria 11 especially under the new case law. 12 13 And finally, I also want to repeat what Betsy 14 DeWitt so eloquently said. We already have a denial. 15 We don't know why the denial was taken out. It does not seem that the denial was removed for any 16 17 substantive reasons about the quality of the project. 18 And before there was some kind of influence, they were 19 all thinking of their -- it says, "The conceptual site 20 plan is not appropriate for the site due to the 21 elimination by the project of the existing greenbelt 2.2 buffer between the current Hancock Village residence 23 and the abutting single-family neighborhood homes. The proposed project contains inadequate setbacks. 24

massing of the proposed five-story building is 1 2 generally inappropriate, and it's just generally not appropriate for the site because it does not adequately 3 use topography to mitigate impact on surrounding 5 neighborhoods and the proposed building does not integrate well into the existing development pattern in the area." That's as clear as you can get. Doesn't seem like there has to be a big struggle on that issue. 10 Thank you very much. 11 MR. VARRELL: Good evening. My name is 12 William Varrell. I live at 45 Asheville Road. I'm also a professional engineer. I just want to -- I know 13 14 this isn't a drainage meeting, but a statement was made 15 that porous pavement is a proven system. I just want to be on the record that it's a proven fail three out 16 17 of four times. 18 And I just want to add again, if there's going 19 to be a whole new drainage design -- I spent about 40

24 get it as soon as possible so I can review it.

this. I do this on my own time on weekends.

hours reviewing the original one, so I'd like have at

least a week or two of time to prepare to read through

there's a whole new design, I'd just like to be able to

20

21

22

23

```
Secondly, I'd like to endorse the idea of the
 1
      VFW Parkway opening, and closing Asheville Road. I
 2
      think one of the things we learned from the traffic
 3
      study was that traffic on Asheville Road was going to
 5
      increase by 60 percent, so if they have access to the
      VFW Parkway, which the traffic engineer said had an
      unlimited supply in his words or something, that this
      tiny project wouldn't impact it at all, then they
 8
      should take advantage of that unlimited supply and
10
      close off Asheville, because it was never really
      permanent in the first place. I don't even know why
11
12
      it's there.
13
               Another point I'd like to make is during the
14
      traffic study they brought up the point that they had a
15
      heavy reliance on satellite parking and they assured us
      that most of the parking was going to service the
16
17
      building right in front of it. It seems like it's
18
      going to this five-story building. They're turning
19
      that around and now they are relying heavily on
20
      satellite parking.
21
               And the point I made at the traffic meeting
22
      was that people were double parking on these narrow
23
      roads to move groceries and people inside and out. I
      mean, they might have a few drop-off points for a few
24
```

people, but there's going to be hundreds and hundreds 1 2 of cars that are coming in here during rush hour and 3 everything, so not everyone can use that little under-thing that they're going to make to drive in 5 front of the building. So I don't see anything on that plan that looks like a sidewalk or a -- I'm not exactly 7 sure how they're going to get from that huge Target-sized parking they're going to put next to my 8 house. 10 That leads to my next point, which is pedestrian movement. That was another thing that was 11 very important to me at the last meeting, and it seems 12 13 like it still hasn't been addressed and I quess it just 14 won't be addressed. But how the pedestrians are going 15 to move not only from that parking spot up to the tower, but also from the tower to the park across the 16 17 street, to the other buildings, the kids going into the 18 neighborhood. I mean, they're trying to integrate this 19 into the neighborhood, so I imagine kids will be going 20 to Asheville, Russett, Bonad, all these other roads. 21 Is this project going to be ADA compliant for 22 handicapped persons? I'm sure they'll have a few spots 23 in front of the building, but will a handicapped person 24 be able to go from the tower to any of the

- 1 neighborhood? Because there is sidewalk throughout the
- 2 whole neighborhood.
- 3 And then finally I just want to say that the
- 4 tower, four stories was horrible; five stories are just
- 5 too many people living on top of each other. This is
- 6 the early spring. Windows are open at bedtime, and
- 7 right now the traffic is ridiculous outside my window.
- 8 You can't even go to sleep. I can't wait to put my air
- 9 conditioner in.
- And I just think it's just too many people.
- It's too much of a burden to put on such a small area.
- 12 You know, the rest of the neighborhood is not disbursed
- 13 that way and I just think -- considering if this was
- 14 your neighborhood and this is a stone's throw, this is
- 50 yards from my house, if this was going to be 50
- 16 yards from your house, five stories, several hundred
- 17 people, and just realistically as long as you ask
- 18 yourself that from your point of view, wherever you
- 19 live, I think we'll all come to the same conclusion
- 20 that it's just not fair. Thank you
- MR. GALLITANO: Good evening. My name is Tom
- 22 Gallitano. I'm a Town Meeting member from Precinct
- 23 16. I live at 146 Bonad Road where I've lived for 20
- years, and I'm an attorney in Boston.

```
1
               I won't repeat the comments that have been
      already made. There have been so many eloquent
 2
 3
      comments made tonight, and I agree with all of the
      comments about the continued objectionable nature of
 5
      this development.
               When I heard earlier this week that there was
      a revised plan that was being presented tonight, my
 7
      initial thought was that the developer finally had
 8
      heard your concerns and heard the concerns of other
10
      commissions and boards in the town and heard the
      neighbors' concerns and were going to come back with
11
12
      something that would not involve large amounts of
13
      building in the greenbelt and would scale back the
14
      proposed apartment building.
15
               So you can imagine my surprise and my shock
      and, frankly, discouragement tonight to see this.
16
17
      have still the entire greenbelt being built over.
18
      increasing of the apartment building, four-stories to
19
      five and really seven, is the equivalent, frankly, of a
20
      poke in the eye with a sharp stick. It's frankly
21
      unthinkable to me given that that exact proposal had
22
      been rejected back in February of 2013 by
23
      MassDevelopment. It's a mystery I think to all of us.
24
               Two comments I want to make specifically:
```

```
One, it's difficult enough as it is -- you know, I'm
 1
 2
      not a transportation expert, but I do know a little bit
      about state permitting, and it's difficult enough as it
 3
      is to get a curb cut and a road approved to a state
 5
      road such as the VFW Parkway. I want to remind
      everybody that what the developer is proposing is not a
 7
      road. They're proposing a driveway. And the notion
 8
      that the state is going to approve a curb cut to a
      driveway is, I think, quite ridiculous. The odds are
10
      that that's going nowhere. So we're going to have
      access to Asheville Road, which presents its own set of
11
12
      problems.
13
               And lastly, I know that you're under no
14
      obligation to take questions and answer questions from
      the community tonight, but speaking for myself and I
15
      think for pretty much everybody else here, it would be
16
      helpful to us if you could at least describe to us the
17
18
      process that the ZBA would go through in terms of
19
      testing the developer's theory about what is an
      allowable height for the apartment complex as compared
20
21
      to what we heard earlier tonight from Dr. Abner, Tony
22
      Abner, who was one of the earlier speakers.
23
               Again, I know you're under no obligation to
      respond necessarily, but it would be extremely helpful
24
```

to the neighbors if you might address that tonight. 1 2 Thank you. 3 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Anybody else? (No response.) 5 We've had a number of good questions, so we'll give a few answers. In no particular order, let's 6 7 start with the notion, first of all, that the boundary 8 lines of the parcels have changed. Have the lot lines changed? And if they have 10 changed, what allows you to do this, and what prevents you from expanding them in any other fashion and 11 12 incorporating other land and moving buildings elsewhere? 13 14 MR. LEVIN: The lot lines have changed. lot lines have changed in a manner that do not render 15 16 the remainder lot nonconforming and, in fact, that is 17 the restriction for moving them, in this case, 18 dramatically as it would render the existing -- or the 19 remaining lot nonconforming. 2.0 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Do you have a diagram of 21 what -- can you explain to us exactly how it has 22 changed and go into greater detail about the issue with 23 expanding the lot line otherwise. 24 So I understand that you've got potential

problems of creating nonconformities for other existing 1 2 structures as well as infectious invalidity issues. 3 Can you go into that a little bit? MR. JOE GELLER. I'll try. The one place 5 that's been pointed out by a number of people that there was a change in the lot line is right here. The 7 conformance in that area to ensure that the existing 8 buildings stay in conformance with the -- that we don't make them any more nonconforming, the setback, which is 10 something that we -- in the working sessions and the discussions with the building commissioner, we really 11 12 worked hard to figure out was there any leverage or 13 play in those locations. So the line that goes around 14 each one of these buildings is either a side or a rear 15 setback. There was a lot of discussion about what is what and how this works and we're still discussing that 16 17 to make sure that the building inspector is in the same 18 place that we are. But we think that we can -- that there was 19 20 room in this location here to move that line slightly 21 so that we were able to get a building in this one area where there's a wider width between these two 2.2 23 buildings. And we still have the setbacks, so the new 24 lease lot line will go right up to that setback line in

- 1 the corners of this building and the corner of that.
- 2 And if you look at each one of these spaces, that's the
- 3 real straining point for the nonconformance.
- And as we get down in this area, it's also the
- 5 same thing. We end up with 30 feet on this side, 30
- 6 feet on this side. I think there's a different
- 7 dimension here because of the side setback, although
- 8 that's where we took the buildings, so it became less
- 9 of an issue.
- 10 So as you look at the rest of the site, there
- was mention of things like removing the parking
- 12 structures and putting in a building. Well, if you
- 13 remove the parking structures, then you're removing
- 14 parking. Parking is currently nonconforming. You're
- making that more nonconforming.
- So those are the constraints that we kept
- 17 pushing in and out against as we worked to try to make
- 18 a 40B lease lot that was consistent with what we were
- 19 allowed to do. Does that get there?
- 20 MR. JESSIE GELLER: I understand how you get
- 21 there. I feel like I need to ask the building
- 22 commissioner. If he could stand up and speak to this
- 23 calculation and whether he's reviewed it and where he
- is in the process of verifying this analysis.

MR. BENNETT: Good evening. Dan Bennett, 1 2 building commissioner. The building department staff, planning staff, 3 and representatives of the developer have met on 5 several occasions to review this issue, and it revolves around 40B rights and 40A rights. And the goal is --7 or was by the developer, obviously, to preserve their rights under 40B, to develop on the property under 40B 8 rights and not adversely affect or create more 10 nonconformities under the 40A or non-40B parcel. 11 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Because then they have to come in and get relief from us, which they may not get. 12 13 MR. BENNETT: Right. You're subject to 14 variance and special permits and other review processes 15 under 40A, and you don't get the same protections as 16 they would under 40B. 17 So during a number of these meetings, initially we did identify a number of issues with 18 19 respect to these lease lot lines and the distances and 20 setbacks that were assumed by the developer. After 21 careful review with staff, we identified these. We 22 met, we showed them to them, and they revised some of 23 those lot lines to, again, not create more 24 nonconformities on the 40A lot. That did open up, on

- 1 that western parcel, the ability to locate that
- 2 building. We think at this point that that side is
- 3 pretty well set.
- 4 On the other side, there were some issues with
- 5 respect to, again, lease lot lines around some existing
- 6 parking areas. Our bylaw specify setbacks to parking
- 7 lots, parking areas. They revised those around the
- 8 apartment building, again, to not create more
- 9 nonconformities.
- 10 That's pretty much it. At this point, we are
- 11 still discussing some of the access issues, common
- 12 drives, and trying to work on seeing how the bylaw
- 13 affects those issues.
- 14 And just one other point. The reason that the
- 15 lease lot line is treated as a lot line is a very
- unique definition that the Town of Brookline has in
- 17 their bylaw. We have -- a lot is defined, then it goes
- 18 A, B, C. C talks about a piece of land that's under a
- 19 99-year lease with at least 50 years remaining. That
- 20 would constitute a lot, and in our minds that then
- 21 creates lot lines, so that's why we have enforced
- 22 zoning on these lease lot lines as they're regular lot
- 23 lines for zoning purposes.
- MR. JESSIE GELLER: Thank you.

1 MR. ZUROFF: I wanted to ask you your opinion on the building height issue. 2 3 MR. BENNETT: We really haven't looked at that because it's kind of -- it's still been a moving 5 target. We identified that early on in the process, that we felt that the original application -- that we felt that a waiver was necessary. They originally gave an opinion that they met the height requirement. We 8 felt that they did not, initially looking at it very 10 quickly. And based on that, they came in with a waiver request. We have not run numbers or looked at what the 11 12 difference is between what the zoning bylaw allows and what the applicant is proposing. We can certainly do 13 14 that and report back to the Board. 15 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Just to touch on that for a moment, my understanding is that the applicant is 16 not asking us -- you know, they're not looking to come 17 18 in under the notion that they meet the height 19 requirement. They've asked for a variance. 2.0 MR. ZUROFF: No. I understand that, and I 21 want the audience to understand that too. The request 2.2 under 40B is to allow things that are not in 23 conformance. That's part of the process. 24 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Right.

1 MR. BENNETT: If the Board would like an 2 answer to how nonconforming it's going to be, we could work on that and let you know. 3 MR. HUSSEY: That was my question, too, the 5 height issue. 6 MR. ZUROFF: Mr. Chairman, I think it's also 7 important that the audience and the public know that 8 the lot lines that we are discussing were created specifically, I believe, unless the developer clarifies 10 it to the contrary -- it's my understanding lot lines 11 were created so that you could justify a 40B 12 application. And the fact that Chestnut Hill Realty or 13 some other entity controls abutting property, which is 14 all part of the Hancock Village development, is 15 irrelevant within the context of a 40B application. 16 I correct? 17 MR. JESSIE GELLER: I think so. Sounds like 18 it. 19 MR. ZUROFF: Okay. The point is that, again, 20 this is a creature of statute. This application was 21 born out of the statute, and certain things were done 22 by the developer so that it could qualify under the 23 provisions of the statute, and that's why we're here. 24 MR. JESSIE GELLER: I was more focused on the

notion that the reason they've created this shape of 1 2 the lot was because they don't want to impact the 3 balance of their property. MR. ZUROFF: Exactly. 5 MR. JESSIE GELLER: So as wonderful as the Gladstone proposal may be, the problem is you raise all 6 7 sorts of other zoning issues. MR. GLADSTONE: I solve could that. 8 MR. JESSIE GELLER: No doubt you could. 10 Other questions we had -- I think, Sam, we had a couple that you need to address. 11 12 MR. NAGLER: In terms of approaching 13 MassDevelopment and what the applicant needs to do 14 vis-a-vis MassDevelopment, it is clear they do have to 15 notify MassDevelopment that there's been a change. 16 then at that point it's up to MassDevelopment, not to 17 the Board, to MassDevelopment to decide whether the 18 change is substantial. And normally they would 19 define -- either the comprehensive permit is granted or 20 the parties go before the Housing Appeals Committee. 21 If they determine it's substantial, either the 22 applicant or the selectmen or the Board of Appeals 2.3 could ask for an immediate determination. But at the end of the day, they have to have 24

the approval of MassDevelopment because if they don't, 1 2 they go to the building inspector and say, okay, here are detailed plans -- let's say the comprehensive 3 permit is granted -- we've gotten a comprehensive 5 permit, here are detailed plans, please give us a building permit. The building inspector is required 7 under the regulations to determine that the plans are 8 consistent with the final approval granted by MassDevelopment. 10 So even if, you know, the comprehensive permit is granted, you can't get a building permit unless the 11 12 building inspector can make the determination that 13 whatever plans are in front of them have been approved 14 by MassDevelopment. 15 If it's still not clear, I'm happy to answer 16 it. 17 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Let me ask it a different 18 way. 19 Does the ZBA have the authority to say, stop 20 the proceeding, go back to MassDevelopment, and get 21 MassDevelopment to reauthorize this? 22 MR. NAGLER: No. 23 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Does the ZBA have the 24 ability to somehow, while hearing this, to submit this

```
to MassDevelopment? Is it anywhere within our
 1
 2
      purview?
 3
               MR. NAGLER:
                            The ZBA can -- once the request
      has been submitted, can ask MassDevelopment -- I'll
 5
      read it to you from the regs.
               If the subsidizing agency -- that's
 7
      MassDevelopment -- finds that the changes are
      substantial, it shall ordinarily defer any review
 8
      except if the applicant, the chief executive officer,
10
      of the municipality or the Town -- that's the Board of
      Selectmen -- or the Board requests otherwise -- so
11
12
      either the board has issued a comprehensive permit or
      the application's been denied, then the applicant can
13
14
      lodge an appeal to the Housing Appeals Committee at
15
      which time the subsidizing agency shawl make that
16
      determination.
17
               So if and when the request is submitted to
      MassDevelopment and MassDevelopment says, yes, this is
18
19
      a substantial change, it's in MassDevelopment's
20
      purview, not the Board's, at that time.
21
               But if MassDevelopment says, yes, this is a
22
      substantial change but we are just going to defer
23
      review, we're going to wait to do it later, that's when
24
      the Board can step in and say, no, MassDevelopment,
```

make that determination now, as can the selectmen, as 1 2 can the applicant. MR. JESSIE GELLER: But we don't have the 3 ability to stop the process? 5 MR. NAGLER: Correct. Also, there was a question about Mass 7 Historic. MR. JESSIE GELLER: Okay. MR. NAGLER: Approval by a separate statue, 10 totally separate from 40B, approval of Mass Historic is absolutely required for this project. The applicant is 11 12 required to submit something called a project 13 notification form to Mass Historic, and it makes a 14 determination under its statute. 1.5 The Board cannot deny the comprehensive permit because that determination has not been made yet, but 16 17 it can condition -- it can specifically make as a condition to the comprehensive permit that this 18 19 permission, this approval be obtained from Mass 2.0 Historic. 21 Frankly, even if it didn't make that a 22 condition, the project cannot go forward unless Mass 23 Historic gives approval. 24 MR. LISS: So for clarification, the Historic

Commission can essentially say no and 40B rules have to 1 2 essentially take that and swallow it and that's it. 3 MR. NAGLER: If the Historic Commission says, no, the project can't be built for reasons having 5 nothing to do with 40B, it can't be built for reasons of an historic statute. 7 MR. JESSIE GELLER: So we don't have the 8 ability to say go to Mass Historic? 9 MR. NAGLER: No. Not first. We can condition 10 the comprehensive permit --11 MR. JESSIE GELLER: I understand that. 12 MR. NAGLER: -- to any grant of the 13 comprehensive permit. 14 MR. JESSIE GELLER: But they're subject to it 15 anyway? 16 MR. NAGLER: Correct. 17 MR. BOOK: Can I just ask for clarification? 18 Is the developer obligated to go to 19 MassDevelopment with the change now, or can they wait 20 until after the Board has ruled on the comprehensive 21 permit? 22 MR. NAGLER: The regs aren't clear on the 23 timing. I would say it would be preferable, just 24 speaking from the developers' standpoint, before they

- 1 spend time, effort, money, whatever to get a reading
- from MassDevelopment, but the regs are not specific on
- 3 the time frame.
- 4 MR. BOOK: I don't know if that counts as a
- 5 formal process.
- 6 MR. NAGLER: It's an informal discussion, but
- 7 it's a formal process, submitting notice to
- 8 MassDevelopment.
- 9 UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Question,
- 10 please?
- 11 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Yes.
- 12 UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Has the
- original proposal been withdrawn?
- 14 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Well, that's a good
- 15 question. Let me rephrase it, if I may.
- Is this plan that you are submitting, the
- 17 revised plan, is this now the official plan?
- MR. O'FLAHERTY: No.
- 19 MR. ZUROFF: The question is, at what point
- does it become the official application that we're
- 21 acting on?
- MR. O'FLAHERTY: My name is Kevin O'Flaherty.
- 23 I'm one of the lawyers from Goulston & Storrs for the
- 24 developers.

The position of the developer is as follows: 1 2 What we propose -- the revised plan under consideration sets forth a plan that, if this Board agrees to it, we 3 would accept and not appeal. 5 In other words, what we tried to do was listen to the town planning group that met with our client and 7 to the other members of the town staff that met and take into consideration the concerns that were raised and to come back with a plan that we thought addressed them as we heard them. And what we've done is 10 basically put that plan out, and we called it 11 12 "modifications under consideration." The consideration 13 really is for you all. 14 I will say this on the record: If this Board accepted those modifications and included them in a 15 16 comprehensive permit that would effectively condition 17 the original submission to comply with this, the 18 developer would be satisfied. 19 So I don't think I can be more clear than that 20 right now, and I think properly that's the process, 21 because what we did was submit an original application 22 with an original proposal. What happens in the context 23 of 40B throughout the Commonwealth in almost every situation is when those original plans are submitted, 24

- 1 boards like you, you know, on the basis of your review,
- the Town's review, public comment, there's a push and
- 3 pull. They make adjustments, they make
- 4 recommendations.
- 5 There's an iterative process that at the end
- 6 of the day, the original plan remains the original plan
- 7 and what happens is it gets modified in the context of
- 8 the Board's action and the original plan gets
- 9 conditioned to match the conditions that the Board
- 10 wants to adopt.
- 11 What we're putting forth here is a plan which
- 12 I would say embodies the conditions, if you will, that
- 13 the developer would be prepared to accept and not
- 14 appeal. Is that roughly clear?
- 15 MR. NAGLER: Well, I don't think that's
- 16 tenable as a practical matter. There has to be a plan
- 17 to be deliberated. And I'm just quoting from the
- 18 Board's local rules. It states that the applicant
- 19 submits a revised plan for the Board's consideration
- and said plan is the plan that's the subject to the
- 21 Board's hearing and deliberation. Any application
- 22 shall be deemed to be revised to reflect such revised
- 23 plans subject to the forgoing provisions which are set
- 24 forth in the paragraph.

```
1
               MR. O'FLAHERTY: I'm sorry. You were reading
 2
      from what?
 3
               MR. NAGLER: From the local 40B rules.
               MR. ZUROFF: Well, you know, that issue aside,
      I think something's got to be under consideration.
 5
 6
               MR. LISS: Practically, why are we having a
 7
      peer review of this stuff and spending time and money
      if essentially this is, A, this is not the plan; and B,
 8
      it's not firm before us? So what are we doing?
10
               MR. O'FLAHERTY: Let me answer the first
      question I think you had first -- well, the second
11
12
      question.
13
               It is before you. I think what I'm trying to
14
      say is that what we've shown here is a plan we're
15
      prepared to accept. So in other words, it's a firm
16
      plan in that regard. It's as if we went and marked up
17
      the original plan and said here are the changes we're
18
      proposing that we think meet the concerns of the
19
      planning body and we're telling --
2.0
          MR. LISS: We get that. If we want this, this
21
      is the one that's going to go. But we're employing
22
      peer review to review this and we're spending time and
23
      we're building models and we're discussing here now
24
      almost on three hours. Why have a peer review if we
```

cannot edit this further? That's a pretty good 1 2 question, I think. MS. NETTER: First of all, I have never, and 3 I've doing this many, many years, seen an applicant 5 come in with a plan revision and say, gee, we're going to submit this if you approve it as is; otherwise we're 7 back with our original application. That's number 1. This is not the 40B practice. 8 Number 2 is, as Attorney Nagler said, the Zoning Board's rules clearly provide that once there is 10 a revised plan it's a substitute for the original 11 12 plans. 13 Number 3 is that, as you know as well as I do, 14 that 40B is governed -- the review process -- by a 180-day limit and there is no possible way to apply 15 that limit if a town is being told we don't know which 16 17 plan is at play. If you give us Plan B lock, stock, and barrel, that's the plan; otherwise we go back to 18 19 the original plan. So the short story is, you have, as our 20 21 understanding, submitted a revised plan and that is the 22 plan that is going to be subject to review. 23 And if that is not the case, you need to be 24 make absolutely clear, because that is contrary to any

discussions that have occurred during the working 1 2 sessions. 3 MR. O'FLAHERTY: Well, I -- are you calling on 4 somebody else? 5 MR. NAGLER: If it's okay with the Chairman, I 6 wanted to ask the town administrator to --7 MR. O'FLAHERTY: Did you want me to try to 8 respond to your questions, or do you want to hear from them first? 10 MS. NETTER: It's up to the Chairman. 11 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Is this on this specific 12 topic? 13 MR. KLECKNER: Yes. 14 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Okay. So why don't we 15 hear your response. 16 MR. KLECKNER: My name is Mel Kleckner. I'm 17 the town administrator. And at our great peril, we 18 have been engaging in these working sessions with the 19 developer in good faith to try to make this a better 20 project for the town. 21 It's mind boggling to me. I'm not a lawyer, 22 so I have no idea what was said, but I have -- I'm 23 appalled. And we said this to the developer, that we

didn't want to engage our time and effort if there was

24

no commitment to try to make this better. I have no 1 2 idea what that means, that this is a plan under consideration, and we'll consider taking it off the 3 table. That is very upsetting to me. I want to say that publicly. 5 MR. JESSIE GELLER: I'd like to give 7 Mr. O'Flaherty ... MR. O'FLAHERTY: Can I have one second? 8 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Yes. 10 MR. ZUROFF: If I understand what the 11 developer is saying, I think the developer is saying to 12 us that what he's put before us today is a set of 13 conditions which he is asking us to impose and accept 14 his project with those conditions and not with any 15 other conditions. So it's an alternate proposal. 16 MR. JESSIE GELLER: No. I disagree with 17 that. 18 MR. ZUROFF: Well, I'm asking if that's what 19 he's proposing. 2.0 MR. O'FLAHERTY: What we're saying is that 21 we're certainly prepared to accept what you just said. 22 We're certainly prepared to accept that. We understand 23 that the process will continue, that there will be 24 revisions that perhaps will be suggested, that there

- 1 will be further analysis done. We understand that.
- 2 And that there may be requests from the Board, from
- 3 their peer reviewers that we consider other
- 4 modifications. We'll certainly consider them in good
- 5 faith.
- I just want to be clear, I guess is what I'm
- 7 trying to do is to be clear that what we put out here
- 8 today is what we think would work for us, what we think
- 9 we could agree to if that's where the Board came out.
- 10 Does it mean that this is the quuntlet, that
- 11 there could be no other modifications?
- 12 No, it doesn't mean that. There may be other
- 13 things that people want to ask us to consider, we
- 14 consider them, and they're perfectly acceptable. They
- 15 would be additional conditions or additional
- 16 modifications. I want to be clear on that.
- 17 The other point, to get back to Ms. Netter and
- 18 Attorney Nagler, we would -- having heard what you read
- 19 from the Brookline local bylaws and regulations about
- 40B, I understand your position. We'll accept that
- 21 this is under your regulations, under your ordinance
- 22 for a revised plan or whatever the word was that was in
- 23 the ordinance. I don't remember it. And that will go
- from here on the revised plan.

```
MR. JESSIE GELLER: So this is the revised
 1
      plan of which we are --
 2
 3
               MR. O'FLAHERTY: As defined in your regs,
      which I wasn't aware of until now.
 5
               So I think, you know, that's what we're
      subject to; that's what we'll live by. But I do want
      to be clear that what we think we've produced at this
      point, which we understand is going to be subject to
      review and the like, is a plan that we think, if that's
10
      the way it came out, we would certainly accept it
      obviously, because now it's the plan we propose.
11
               MR. ZUROFF: So the application before the
12
      Board is this plan that you submitted tonight?
13
14
               MR. O'FLAHERTY: Yes.
15
               MR. BOOK: The plan had been withdrawn?
16
               MR. O'FLAHERTY: Yes.
17
               MR. ZUROFF: So, Mr. Nagler, does the plan
      that's before the Board have to be submitted in total,
18
19
      like all of the other materials that we've considered?
20
      If this is the new plan, do we need all of the
21
      materials submitted in support of it?
22
               MR. NAGLER: Ultimately, you're going to want
23
      to see -- some of the existing site conditions haven't
24
      changed, but ultimately, I don't think you just stop
```

the hearings until you get every piece of paper that 1 2 goes with this complication. But ultimately, you're 3 going to want to see the enumerated items in the regulations so you can make an informed decision -that have changed as a result of this complication. 5 MR. ZUROFF: Then under those circumstances 7 where there is so much more material that has to be 8 submitted to us and subject to peer review, do we have the right to say to the developer we need to extend the 10 time? MR. NAGLER: That's a very complicated 11 12 question. 13 MS. NETTER: I believe, and my recommendation 14 is that -- I hear what you're saying and it's one of 15 the things I wrote down -- is we need to chart exactly -- I mean, we can't predict exactly, but we 16 17 have been working on this. The staff is constantly 18 redoing it -- but how many hearings are needed, how 19 much information is required, and put a chart together 20 and see what's possible without having to rush you and 21 giving the public adequate time to consider the plan. 22 And by the way, perhaps people didn't hear, 23 but at the beginning Chairman Geller had said, yes, 24 you've just gotten this plan. However, at the next

hearing there will be another opportunity to comment 1 2 and you will have opportunities to comment throughout this public hearing process, so I believe you will have 3 adequate time to review this plan and give your 5 thoughtful input. So the short story is, we'll look at it, come back to you and see. But yes, if we need more 7 time we will request it, and I'd be surprised if the 8 applicant didn't grant it. MR. ZUROFF: Thank you. 10 MS. KOOCHER: Hi. I'm Robin Koocher, 285 Beverly Road, and I want to thank you because this is 11 12 the first time for all of these meetings that we have 13 heard a conversation -- it was commented before. 14 now get a glimpse of what we've been dealing with for 15 five and a half years, because getting a straight answer is virtually impossible and you just commented 16 17 that just an answer in terms of the 180 days is 18 complicated. And I understand that, you know, you have to look at things. 19 20 But the comment that was made before regarding 21 those -- and you'll forgive me if I forgot the name --22 but the -- what was supposed to be presented to you by 23 tomorrow, which is what? The structure? 24 MR. JESSIE GELLER: The model.

1 MS. KOOCHER: The model. And you said that 2 was the deadline. Why can't it be the deadline? This, again, is 3 what we have dealt with, this kind of slippery back and 5 forth and kind of confusion and we don't know -- I mean, Ms. Steinfeld said 83 trees would be saved; 7 Mr. Geller said one-hundred-and-something others. When asked about specifics in terms of how far back would 8 things be moved, I didn't hear specific numbers. This 10 is now the new plan. Why don't we have those answers 11 for you to deliberate about and consider, and to those 12 of us who have been dealing with this, and the rest of 13 Brookline, everybody who will be affected, to know 14 these things. 15 And so what just happened here, I certainly hope we will continue to see where --16 17 MR. JESSIE GELLER: I'm sorry. What is the 18 question? MS. KOOCHER: Will we be able to hear, for 19 example, the building commissioner explain in English 20 21 for those of us -- you know, perhaps you understand 2.2 We don't. And also for these two people to 23 explain, you know, more about what the process is. 24 And we just saw a change from -- the new plan

- 1 would incorporate this newer plan, and then now this
- 2 plan is the plan and the old plan from yesterday is not
- 3 the plan. And this is what I'm talking about. This is
- 4 what's confusing. And I'm a fairly intelligent
- 5 person. So is everybody else in this room. And we
- 6 need to understand these things. You know, we can read
- 7 a plan. I've read every plan for five years. Do I
- 8 understand all of it? No. But this is what we've been
- 9 looking for. Please give us more of it. Thank you.
- 10 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Other questions? Any
- 11 others? Announcements? No?
- 12 Actually, you were wrong. I hate to even
- 13 suggest that you were wrong.
- MS. NETTER: No, you don't.
- 15 MR. JESSIE GELLER: I did not mention that at
- the next hearing, which is on the 19th, we will hear
- 17 the preliminary review from peer review on urban
- 18 design -- however you want to phrase that term,
- 19 Mr. Hussey. I don't want to get taken down by you.
- 20 And after the preliminary report by our peer reviewer,
- 21 the public will have an opportunity to provide comments
- 22 on that preliminary report.
- 23 MS. NETTER: Excuse me. I knew it was your
- 24 thinking.

1 MR. JESSIE GELLER: It was my thinking. 2 The hearing after that hearing, which is July 10th, we are tentatively thinking now that that will be 3 the revisitation of stormwater. Is that still 5 correct? MS. STEINFELD: We were actually thinking that 7 it would be the final report of the urban design. MR. JESSIE GELLER: Assuming he's far enough 8 along, it will be the final report of urban design, 10 depending on time constraints. 11 Any stormwater, or are we just going to push 12 that off one week or whatever --13 MS. STEINFELD: We can discuss it, but I would 14 suggest pushing it up. 15 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Okay. So we're hoping to 16 get urban design in both preliminarily in the 19th and 17 then final on July the 10th and then move on to the 18 revisitation of the stormwater. And again, when we hear stormwater, the public 19 20 will have an opportunity to speak at that point based 21 on the reports that we get. 22 UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Are you going 23 to plan another visit? 24 MR. JESSIE GELLER: That was a great

- 1 suggestion, so I give you great credit for that. It's
- 2 been something that's sort of been nagging in my mind
- 3 because I was so cold by the end of that site I'm not
- 4 sure what I saw.
- 5 UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: It looks a lot
- 6 different right now.
- 7 MR. JESSIE GELLER: So yes, I actually think
- 8 that would be an excellent proposal and we'll make
- 9 those arrangements. I don't know that -- can we pick a
- 10 date now or --
- 11 UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can you come
- 12 during rush hour to see what our neighborhood is like
- and how long it takes us to get out?
- 14 MR. JESSIE GELLER: Wasn't the last one during
- 15 rush hour?
- MR. LISS: 8:30 a.m. we were there.
- MR. JESSIE GELLER: It would be 8:30.
- 18 UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: That's after
- 19 the school rush hour.
- 20 UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: That's too
- 21 late.
- 22 UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: 7:30 would be
- 23 better.
- MR. LISS: For who?

```
MR. JESSIE GELLER: We will work out a date
 1
 2
      for a new site visit, and we will make it clear to the
      public when that is and figure out a time and a date
 3
      and a location where to meet. We will make those
 5
      arrangements and announce them.
 6
               There being nothing else, motion to adjourn?
 7
               Seconded.
               All in favor?
 8
               Continued to June 19th.
10
               (Proceedings suspended at 9:58 p.m.)
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

```
I, Kristen C. Krakofsky, Court Reporter and
 1
 2
      Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of
 3
      Massachusetts, certify:
               That the foregoing proceedings were taken
      before me at the time and place herein set forth and
 5
      that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of
 7
      my shorthand notes so taken.
 8
               Dated this 17th day of June, 2014.
10
      Kristen Krakofsky, Notary Public
11
      My commission expires November 3, 2017.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
```

	1	I	I
A	accommodate	19:16,22 26:19 41:18	84:23
abandoned	12:3 61:11	49:3 59:12 62:10	agencies
48:20	accommodations	70:18,23 72:13 99:1	79:5
ability	66:16	106:11	agency
39:24 103:1 107:24	accompanies	addressed	50:18,22 69:21,24
109:4 110:8	45:11	19:1 24:23 28:18 31:7	108:6,15
able	accomplish	31:19 74:21 92:8	agenda
15:1,4,7,12 16:1,14,19	18:4	95:13,14 112:9	52:24 68:18 80:9
17:13 18:2,21 19:11	achieve	adds	82:16,17,18
19:16,19 35:8 41:7	7:4 22:21,22	77:22	aggregate
60:22 73:12 78:5	achieved	adequate	20:11
93:23 95:24 100:21	10:8 22:23	120:21 121:4	ago
122:19	acknowledged	adequately	56:5 60:15 61:1 71:1
Abner	70:7	39:24 93:3	73:19 82:11
2:23 43:1,1 98:21,22	acreage	adhered	agree
absolutely	91:12	38:16	5:2,4 41:22 64:12
45:2 59:16 109:11	acres	adherence	66:17 68:8,9 73:16
115:24	11:12 21:3 27:22	38:13	80:15 97:3 118:9
abutter	91:13	adjacent	agreed
51:16 67:20 82:3	Act	10:6	56:5 73:22
abutters	79:1	adjourn	agreement
12:12 28:14	acting	126:6	21:16 26:10 86:22
abutting	111:21	adjustment	87:2,4 92:7
14:10 16:15 27:3	action	91:23	agrees
28:16 44:22,24 45:8	113:8	adjustments	112:3
45:15 55:7 79:14	actively	113:3	ain't
92:23 105:13	60:5	administrative	71:2 75:3
accept	actual	5:14	air
112:4 113:13 114:15	32:18 45:3,24 50:23	administrator	96:8
117:13,21,22 118:20	ADA	2:15 116:6,17	Alan
119:10	95:21	adopt	55:18
acceptable	add	113:10	alerted
89:12 118:14	39:4 47:1 70:15 93:18	advantage	51:6
accepted	added	94:9	Alisa
39:21 112:15	8:4 9:13 12:2 24:6	adversely	3:8 87:7
access	adding	102:9	Alison
12:23 13:11 15:24	9:20 13:17 16:21 23:6	advice	2:12
16:3 17:3 18:13,19	23:8 46:6	41:10	alleyway
18:21,22 19:5 21:24	addition	affect	62:21
22:10 23:9 28:10	29:3 80:23	69:19 102:9	Alliance
31:13 36:13,19 39:6	additional	affordability	89:17
39:7 62:19 63:18	14:22 19:18 23:17	34:13,22 affordable	Allison 26:1 29:14
64:20,22 65:4,5	27:24 28:12 37:23 118:15,15	20:23 34:16,18 53:19	20:1 29:14 allow
69:18 85:19 86:12	address	53:19 58:16 80:2	16:4 18:18 34:19
94:5 98:11 103:11	auuress	33.19 30.10 80.2	10.4 10.10 34.19
		l	

	1		
45:13 46:21 104:22	Anthony	115:4 121:8	architect
allowable	2:23 43:1	application	32:8
98:20	anybody	1:7 6:9 10:13 28:9	architectural
allowance	32:13 35:1 47:3 99:3	36:12 65:20 66:3	29:15 35:11,18,23
44:21 45:23 allowed	anyplace 55:21	77:4 104:6 105:12,15 105:20 111:20	37:6 40:18,20 43:9 58:15
43:10 44:24 46:22	anyway	112:21 113:21 115:7	architecturals
74:10,11 76:14 81:8	64:2 110:15	119:12	37:7
82:19 101:19	apartment	application's	architecture
allows	8:2 9:5,6,8 12:1 20:9	108:13	78:20 84:11
43:18 46:13 99:10	23:3,4 24:14 27:13	apply	architectures
104:12	28:20 34:7 43:4	65:20 86:1,2 115:15	40:18
alternate	57:15 58:7 62:18	appointed	area
117:15	63:10 76:9 80:14	26:7	14:14,15,18,24,24
alternative	85:1 88:23 89:2	appreciate	15:9,10 17:14 24:16
29:22	97:14,18 98:20 103:8	41:21 48:6 56:7,15	42:5,10,10,19,22
alternatives	apartments	62:7 70:7 74:6 80:17	44:1 46:19 53:20
25:16	9:20 57:22 91:11	approaching	57:16,22 58:1 63:20
amenity	appalled	106:12	91:20 93:7 96:11
12:7,10 24:4	116:23	appropriate	100:7,21 101:4
amount	apparently	58:17 59:21 61:17,22	areas
19:12 30:12 35:4	51:2,11 69:3 71:8	63:19 64:5 68:11	14:17 39:3 57:22
50:13 58:11	73:12	79:20,22,23 80:20	78:12 103:6,7
amounts	appeal	90:10 92:20 93:3	arguing
97:12	108:14 112:4 113:14	approval	48:1
analysis	appealed	29:22 36:15,15,20	arisen
101:24 118:1	36:18	50:22 51:7 66:4,8,19	70:18
analyze	Appeals	70:21 107:1,8 109:9	arrangements
90:16	1:5 47:13,14 80:5 88:3 106:20,22 108:14	109:10,19,23	125:9 126:5
anger 71:14	· ·	approvals 22:17 66:2	artery 62:15 63:18
angle	appear 18:18	approve	Asheville
16:13	appearance	49:12 50:23 51:8 86:1	3:9 16:11 18:10 39:6,9
announce	78:1	86:19 98:8 115:6	43:21 44:4 45:24
126:5	Appearances	approved	64:22 93:12 94:2,4
Announcements	2:1	86:5 89:13 98:4	94:10 95:20 98:11
123:11	appears	107:13	aside
answer	48:19 77:7	approves	56:17 65:13 114:4
21:13 45:2 65:23	applicable	65:24	asked
98:14 105:2 107:15	79:11	approximately	6:20,21,23 52:8 59:1
114:10 121:16,17	applicant	27:22 28:3	68:17 88:4 104:19
answered	51:1,10 52:4 69:18	April	122:8
65:19	77:10,18 104:13,16	91:5,6	asking
answers	106:13,22 108:9,13	archeological	52:16,16 70:12 71:19
99:6 122:10	109:2,11 113:18	79:7	86:13 104:17 117:13

117:18	60:2	64:10,13,19 87:13	85:12 120:23
aspect	authorized	106:3	behalf
57:10 74:20	26:9 29:23 30:4 72:21	bandied	6:2 30:4 77:1
aspects	AutoTURN	64:21	believe
29:4 68:3	19:3,4	barrel	19:11,17,24 24:21
assess	available	115:18	37:2,4 46:13 47:3,10
18:9	37:10	barren	56:15 58:16 60:1
assessment	Avalon	56:11	105:9 120:13 121:3
91:3 92:10	55:10 76:10	barriers	believes
asset	Avi	65:12	38:12
57:4	2:7 4:12	based	belt
assistant	aware	4:22 30:20,21 39:19	89:18
4:14	4:5 57:3 92:8 119:4	48:10 90:8 104:10	benefit
Associate	awful	124:20	38:10 63:8
2:6,7	56:17	baseline	Benjamin
associated	Aye	44:18 45:17	49:11
61:12	36:6	basic	Bennett
Associates	a.m	37:8 58:6	2:14 102:1,1,13 104:3
2:11	125:16	basically	105:1
assume		46:24 49:4,11 55:10	best
35:24 44:10	<u>B</u>	112:11	66:18
assumed	В	basing	BETA
102:20	83:11 103:18 114:8	31:2	6:11 21:6 25:12
Assuming	115:17	basis	bets
124:8	back	33:17 113:1	66:10
assured	15:3 17:14 18:3,14,16	Bay	Betsy
94:15	18:17,19,24 33:20	55:10	3:5 76:23 92:13
asterisked	39:24 40:4 42:17	bear	better
11:7	45:20 48:15 50:5,8	43:8 73:2	12:22 16:23 19:21
attend	51:1,5,10 64:9 70:2	beautiful	20:2 29:8 31:1 32:10
53:1	72:6 75:8 76:17,22	88:24	38:19 41:7 53:8,9,11
attorney	83:2,18 97:11,13,22	bedroom	54:4 56:2,16,16
49:10 69:7 70:6,9 88:6	104:14 107:20 112:9	78:8 91:9	58:18 69:9 80:4,4,5
96:24 115:9 118:18	115:7,18 118:17	bedrooms	85:16 88:5 90:3
attractive	121:6 122:4,8	10:9,17 11:5 20:11	116:19 117:1 125:23
12:7	bad	27:10 29:2 35:3	Beverly
audience	30:19,23 53:1 66:20	55:20 61:2 78:6	3:1,7,10 7:10,11 8:14
69:2,9 104:21 105:7	82:21 83:4	80:12,16 83:24 84:1	51:16 61:13 82:4
111:9,12 124:22	badly	84:1,5 91:8	121:11
125:5,11,18,20,22	79:24	bedroom-units	beyond
August	bait	11:4	27:6 61:8 63:23 82:8
72:4	83:16	bedtime	big
authority	Baker	96:6	93:9
51:1 107:19	42:3,7,12,22 53:2 65:3	beginning	bigger
authorization	balance	19:15 48:23 60:11	24:5
waviioi iZativii		17,13 10,23 00,11	21.3
	I	I	I

			_
Bill	Bonad	88:2,11 94:14	27:15,19,19 28:1,2
82:3	95:20 96:23	buffer	37:7 58:3 61:12,18
bird's	Book	15:5 54:3 77:13 79:13	61:24 62:17 79:3
5:24	2:4 4:13 21:22 22:15	88:19 89:10,11 92:22	89:2 95:17 99:12
bit	22:24 110:17 111:4	build	100:8,14,23 101:8
17:21 40:7 45:21 50:5	119:15	43:11,14 46:1,3,10,14	built
60:13 61:16,19 82:2	borings	76:9 77:11,19 84:9	50:21 79:19 84:19
98:2 100:3	90:17,23 91:3,6	building	86:16,17 89:9 97:17
blah	born	2:14 6:22 7:14,21,24	110:4,5
69:24 70:1,1	105:21	8:3,24 9:5,6,7,8,17	built-up
blanking	borrowed	9:20,22 10:12,14,22	76:5 1
87:19	59:18	11:15,17 12:1,6,10	bumps
blasted	Boston	15:11,14 16:2,13,18	65:10
44:7	1:17 96:24	16:19 18:9,14,14,16	burden
blocking	bothered	18:19 20:8,9 23:4,5	96:11
62:14	42:9	23:11,13,20,23 24:14	busy
blowup	bottom	26:3 27:14,17 28:20	56:6
44:13	51:9	28:22 31:21 34:7	bylaw
Bluestein	boundaries	36:1 37:8 43:3,5,15	63:4 103:6,12,17
2:9	61:9	43:19,22 44:21,23	104:12
board	boundary	45:8,13,15,16,22	bylaws
1:5 2:2 4:20 6:4 30:11	99:7	46:4,9,12,16,17,21	45:1 46:11 47:10
32:21 36:6,20 47:13	box	46:23 47:5,15 49:17	118:19
47:14,22 48:7,18	45:20 46:8 89:21	50:2 54:7,8,23 57:15	
50:24 51:9 56:8 69:4	Brady	58:2,7,9,12 61:23	<u> </u>
69:5,23 76:24 77:3,6	49:5	62:12,12,13,18 63:10	C
80:4,7 87:23,23 88:3	brief	63:23 70:23 75:8	1:21 103:18,18 127:1
88:3,6 104:14 105:1	47:19	77:15,23 78:1 79:16	calculation
106:17,22 108:10,11	briefly	80:14 85:1,5,6,13,14	45:20 46:7 101:23
108:12,24 109:15	49:3	85:24 89:7 93:1,5	calculations
110:20 112:3,14	bring	94:17,18 95:5,23	44:18 46:1,3,10,20
113:9 118:2,9 119:13		97:13,14,18 100:11	call
119:18	Brookline	100:17,21 101:1,12	18:4 25:22 76:11
boards	1:5,8,12 4:5,8 6:9	101:21 102:2,3 103:2	called
26:7 32:22 40:17	34:17 39:21 42:2,23	103:8 104:2 107:2,6	70:21 109:12 112:11
97:10 113:1	43:15 44:15 45:1	107:6,11,12 114:23	calling
Board's	47:4,10,15 49:5	122:20	4:4 116:3
80:9 108:20 113:8,18	53:22 55:20 56:21	buildings	calmer 57:16
113:19,21 115:10	57:4 61:10 71:6	6:23 7:1,13,18,21 8:18	calming
body	76:18 77:2 81:13	8:19 9:1,3,4,7,18,19	13:5 21:5 90:5,6,7,11
26:13 114:19	89:9,17 103:16	10:2,5,9,20,21,22	Cambridge
bogeyman	118:19 122:13	14:14,18,23,23 15:1	91:22
90:2	Brookline's	15:6,14 16:12,15	careful
boggling	83:23 84:3	18:8,8,12 20:10,12	102:21
116:21	brought	20:14,15,16 23:3	104.41

		İ	İ
carefully	58:6 78:20 83:3 88:9	Chris	69:13 81:15
65:18,22	89:7,20 99:8,9,10,14	2:5	coherent
cars	99:15,22 119:24	Christopher	67:22
16:4 57:13 65:14 95:2	120:5	4:13	cold
carved	changes	CHR's	65:8 90:20 125:3
61:9	5:12 9:10 27:8 37:8	74:24 90:8	coldest
case	69:22 108:7 114:17	circle	56:10
1:6 49:5,6 51:12 61:11	changing	42:7	college
70:17 72:13 92:12	23:17 31:4 85:8	circulation	47:5
99:17 115:23	Chapter	12:18	combination
catch	29:6 77:4	circumstances	25:9
49:1	characteristics	120:6	combined
certain	78:10 92:3	cited	9:8 22:8
12:22 17:20 47:5	charged	75:11	come
105:21	29:21	clarification	16:1,4,11 19:7 33:9
certainly	chart	109:24 110:17	43:10 68:11,18,20,22
13:19 39:11,14 65:23	120:15,19	clarifies	69:17 70:4 82:14,22
74:19 76:16 104:13	check	105:9	85:8 86:19 90:20
117:21,22 118:4	37:24 42:9 74:18	clear	96:19 97:11 102:12
117.21,22 118.4	checked	31:10 38:9 50:19	104:17 112:9 115:5
	42:13		
certainty		86:24 93:8 106:14	121:6 125:11
30:9	Chestnut	107:15 110:22	comes
certify	1:7 2:17 4:19 6:4 7:3	112:19 113:14	87:14,14
127:3	26:5,11,18,18 27:7	115:24 118:6,7,16	comfortable
chair	28:9 41:6 42:5 46:12	119:7 126:2	17:18,23 18:20
55:19 56:22 59:7	87:18 105:12	clearly	coming
87:16	chief	12:10 31:5 39:8 41:4	30:14 51:22 64:9
Chairman	12:24 17:3,4,10,17	58:15 115:10	71:20 95:2
2:3 6:3 25:24 30:7	18:1 28:5 69:22	client	commend
33:1 40:3 105:6	108:9	112:6	31:4,15
116:5,10 120:23	children	climate	commensurate
challenged	42:11 55:21 61:2 65:2	81:16	23:15
87:2	78:4	clock	comment
chance	chime	48:23	5:5 17:2 34:6,14 41:20
52:20 61:15 71:21	32:14	close	47:21 51:20 59:7
82:2 83:20	Chiumenti	52:14 94:10	61:15 68:24 72:8
change	2:24 47:16,16	closer	85:4 113:2 121:1,2
49:1,2 51:6 54:10 55:9	chooses	8:6 28:14	121:20
55:11 61:21 69:14,18	46:13	closest	commentary
70:19 72:13 75:10	chosen	44:23	41:24
81:16 85:10 88:7	77:10 90:15	closing	commented
91:10 100:6 106:15	CHR	94:2	121:13,16
106:18 108:19,22	5:15 6:2 21:20 31:4	CMR	comments
110:19 122:24	49:16,22 56:12 72:3	69:20 70:4 75:11	5:12,12 28:23 29:10
changed	76:6 90:15	code	30:19 31:1 36:9
	1	1	I

38:23 40:2 51:19	aamulimant	96.10 100.17 19 22	considered
	compliment	86:19 109:17,18,22	13:24 21:17 59:10
54:16 67:22 70:15	58:18	110:9 112:16	
71:22 97:1,3,4,24	comply	conditioned	76:13 80:3 86:3
123:21	5:23 112:17	113:9	91:16,18 119:19
commission	component	conditioner	considering
56:22 57:1,3 79:2,6	39:12	96:9	31:22 47:24 48:3,16
86:6 110:1,3 127:11	comprehensive	conditions	48:19 71:22 75:20
commissioner	6:8 28:8 36:17 50:20	6:15 36:17 64:8 65:24	96:13
2:14 100:11 101:22	50:21 74:15,19 75:14	66:8 75:20 113:9,12	consistency
102:2 122:20	77:5 106:19 107:3,4	117:13,14,15 118:15	38:15
commissions	107:10 108:12	119:23	consistent
58:13,17 97:10	109:15,18 110:10,13	confirm	13:17 26:14 101:18
commitment	110:20 112:16	40:12	107:8
89:6 117:1	comprised	conflicts	constant
commitments	12:4	87:15	84:17
75:19	compromise	conformance	constantly
committed	60:7	100:7,8 104:23	120:17
22:19 26:22 75:15	conceived	confusing	constitute
committee	68:3 79:24	123:4	103:20
55:19 59:8 60:16	concept	confusion	constraints
73:19 106:20 108:14	58:4	122:5	5:8 29:6 37:12,12,20
common	conceptual	conjunction	38:2 40:13 53:24
103:11	92:19	21:6	81:9 101:16 124:10
Commonwealth	concern	connection	constructed
112:23 127:2	18:13 29:1 32:17	42:4	63:24
community	34:12,23 39:4 58:10	conservation	construction
2:13 34:22 57:23	61:1 64:23 81:16	56:23 91:15,21 92:4	77:12 79:2 87:1
76:14 77:15,20 78:11	concerned	consider	consult
98:15	28:20 31:7 32:21 34:7		6:10
		13:12 16:6 32:5 33:2	
compared	34:9 60:13 80:23	34:24 46:15 48:17,20	consultant
30:22 98:20	89:18	52:12 53:4 59:6 60:8	29:15,20 37:23,24
complete	concerning	71:9 80:21 81:19	90:9
79:12	69:14	89:14 117:3 118:3,4	consultants
completed	concerns	118:13,14 120:21	26:4 37:14 54:6 90:15
5:21	12:24 15:20 17:3,8	122:11	consulted
completely	19:1,22 22:12 25:4	considerably	39:18
10:4 14:6	25:11 26:20 30:22	81:14	consulting
complex	31:18 39:20 53:7	consideration	4:15
88:23 98:20	61:6 62:11 70:18	7:20 10:15 12:1 13:9	contained
compliant	80:13 97:9,9,11	32:24 34:16 52:5,9	53:20
95:21	112:8 114:18	52:14 59:14 83:12	contains
complicated	conclusion	112:2,8,12,12 113:19	20:7 92:24
120:11 121:18	96:19	114:5 117:3	context
complication	condition	considerations	105:15 112:22 113:7
120:2,5	66:16,17,18 85:24	32:3	continuation
,			
	ı	ı	I

4:6	60:3	65:12 125:1	56:10 64:7 65:9 68:18
continue		03.12 123.1 crisis	68:19 90:20 106:24
29:10 79:10 117:23	costs 76:20	29:2	113:6 127:8
122:16			
· · ·	cots	criteria	days
continued	55:22	92:11	69:24 82:11,18 121:17
4:4 97:4 126:9	counsel	critical	DCR
Continuing	1:10 59:9	39:12 40:10	22:7,7
78:9	count	crowd	deadline
contrary	23:16	53:1	32:20 33:19 35:9 40:4
105:10 115:24	counts	cultural	52:14 122:2,3
control	111:4	57:2,4	deadlines
65:1	couple	curb	33:16
controls	5:15 21:22 22:2 59:5	28:10 65:21 66:7,10	deal
105:13	60:14,24 67:24 75:12	75:15 98:4,8	33:23 59:17
conventional	106:11	curious	dealing
25:9,9 34:1	course	74:23	121:14 122:12
conversation	18:20 38:21 53:20	current	dealt
30:3,18 60:11,12 67:7	66:6,14 72:21 83:19	13:13 14:19 63:23	122:4
67:8,15,16 69:17	84:18,19 90:18	79:13 83:22 92:22	debate
121:13	court	currently	81:12
conversational	66:9 87:2 127:1	8:7 15:16 33:14 37:1	debt
25:6	cover	78:16 101:14	60:2
converted	60:3	cut	decide
20:15 27:12 29:1	covered	28:10 65:21 66:7,10	106:17
converting	11:17	75:15 98:4,8	decision
10:21	covers	cynical	31:11 85:23 120:4
convinced	78:3	66:20 68:24,24	declined
58:17	cracked	Cyril	34:21
copy	73:9	2:22 42:1	decrease
69:22	crazy		91:9,10
corner	73:24	<u>D</u>	dedicated
101:1	create	Daly	4:9
corners	64:17 102:9,23 103:8	3:6 80:6,6	deductions
101:1	created	Dan	10:8
Corporation	12:6 17:11 23:20	2:14 102:1	deemed
1:15	53:18 105:8,11 106:1	dangerous	113:22
correct	creates	74:8	defects
33:10,11 35:24 36:22	103:21	date	77:9
44:4 105:16 109:5	creating	30:12 71:9 125:10	defer
110:16 124:5 127:6	8:8 100:1	126:1,3	108:8,22
corrected	creation	Dated	deficits
72:21	8:12	127:8	80:1
corridors	creature	David	define
6:24	105:20	3:2 56:20	106:19
cost	credit	day	defined
	•	•	•

-			
103:17 119:3	67:13	70:4 106:23 107:12	42:12
definitely	depth	108:16 109:1,14,16	difference
75:18	73:21	determine	35:21 91:14 104:12
definition	deputy	36:11 106:21 107:7	different
53:11 63:3 103:16	17:10	determined	34:2 42:20 48:16
degree	describe	78:22	52:10 53:10 54:19
38:15,19	21:23 98:17	develop	83:9 101:6 107:17
delay	described	102:8	125:6
71:11,23	18:2 57:7	developed	differently
deliberate	deserves	58:18	15:13 68:7 87:11
122:11	80:4	developer	difficult
deliberated	design	34:15,24 37:21 53:17	22:3 51:20 52:22 98:1
113:17	6:13 12:11,19 28:21	56:5 61:4 65:18 66:1	98:3
deliberation	28:22 30:16 32:18	68:10 70:6 71:11	
113:21			dig 82:2
deliberations	35:17,17,18,19 36:1 36:24 37:5 38:15	73:6 83:10 87:13,17	
85:21 86:4	40:18 41:1 57:11	87:21 88:4,7,16 97:8	digest 81:23
		98:6 102:4,7,20	
delivery	58:4,6 60:5 76:8	105:9,22 110:18	diligently 7:5
65:14	78:11,21 79:18 85:16	112:1,18 113:13	
demand	85:17,18 92:1 93:19	116:19,23 117:11,11	dimension
51:1 80:5	93:23 123:18 124:7,9	120:9	101:7
demands	124:16	developers	dining
81:18	designated	34:19 59:2 65:11	55:21
demoralized	50:18	110:24 111:24	direct
87:12	designed	developer's	18:22 21:24 51:16
denial	8:6 14:9 54:1 57:19	98:19	directed
55:14 66:5,6 79:9 85:3	58:10 63:5 77:19	development	47:12
92:14,15,16	designs	2:13 4:7 27:3 28:11,15	directly
denied	34:3 39:22	29:4 54:12 55:6 57:7	39:8
86:2 89:13 108:13	desires	57:9,11,24 58:5	director
density	69:18	59:13 78:15 83:23	2:13 4:20 12:23 25:22
38:7,20 58:5 80:18,19	despite	84:3,21,23 86:18,20	26:1
deny	9:13	86:22 88:5 89:8,8,15	director's
109:15	destroyed	92:2 93:6 97:5	72:17
department	56:15	105:14	disagree
30:8 31:7,14 54:17,22	destroying	developments	69:11 117:16
54:24 55:5 69:22	54:3	53:22	disappointed
102:3	detail	DeWitt	72:1
departments	13:3 99:22	3:5 76:23,23 92:14	disbursed
26:3	detailed	diagram	96:12
Department's	107:3,5	44:13 45:11,12,21	discouragement
54:20	details	99:20	97:16
depending	5:14 6:1 12:16 24:22	dictate	discuss
124:10	25:1 47:20 54:10	82:16	7:4 8:11 11:24 12:14
depends	determination	died	26:17 43:8 80:17
	•	•	•

124:13	double	early	16:1 70:17 72:12
discussed	94:22	72:4 96:6 104:5	85:20 88:14 100:14
76:16	doubled	easement	106:19,21 108:12
discusses	11:20 20:16	64:7,15	elderly
38:23	doubt	easily	68:19
discussing	70:22 106:9	29:1 65:12	elected
14:13 49:9 81:15	70.22 100.9 Dr	east	26:7
100:16 103:11 105:8	98:21	7:12 8:17 9:12 13:16	elements
114:23	drainage	14:5,7 15:6	37:5
discussion		ĺ .	elevation
4:21 17:4 19:7 80:11	24:20 25:2,7 29:3	easy 39:14	10:12
	30:13 33:21 93:14,19		elevations
80:21 100:15 111:6	dramatically	echo	
discussions	99:18	30:24 81:21 82:6 83:6	10:11
14:12 29:20 58:14	drastic	87:11	eligibility
100:11 116:1	49:2	edge	48:12 49:13 69:19
disrespectful	Driscoll	13:15,16,18 14:18	70:3 79:8
71:15	59:20	15:5 17:1	eligible
dissuade	drive	Edie	57:5 78:22
65:13	7:12 10:6 13:5 16:4,12	4:14	eliminate
distance	16:14 18:9 21:5	edit	6:20,22 62:19 90:3
44:16,23 45:7,14,16	23:20 24:3,11 76:3	115:1	eliminated
45:18 46:5,6,8	95:4	Edith	10:3 11:1,2 14:6,18
distances	driver's	2:10,11 6:10	15:11 17:1 20:5,19
102:19	72:3,10	effect	24:23 27:21 28:4
district	drives	23:4 59:11 76:20	eliminates
6:21 8:2,3 31:23 56:24	39:2 103:12	effective	77:13
91:15,21 92:4	driveway	36:8 65:11	eliminating
divide	8:1 17:5,7,7,24 23:9	effectively	9:7 10:22 14:24 15:6
45:19 47:1	73:9 98:7,9	112:16	elimination
divided	driveways	effort	38:7 79:12 92:21
46:21	11:18	111:1 116:24	eloquent
dividing	drop	efforts	97:2
46:6	24:16	66:19	eloquently
doable	dropped	egregious	92:14
66:1	9:24	64:11	embarrassment
Documents	drop-off	eight	59:2
5:19	94:24	9:18 11:3 27:16	embodies
doing	due	eight-story	113:12
22:5 51:3 64:9 71:12	68:15 71:10,11 79:11	78:1	emergency
81:8 90:22 114:9	92:20	eight-unit	12:22 17:3 31:14
115:4		6:22 7:13,21,24 8:18	39:19,23 65:5
dollars	E	8:24 9:3,19 10:5,12	emphasized
59:19 76:21	earlier	10:20,21,22 20:15	6:17
DOT	13:1 21:2 62:11 97:6	27:19 28:1	employing
22:9,9	98:21,22	either	114:21
	1	1	•

enabling	43:20 44:5	99:21 106:4 120:16	expert
10:1	entryway	120:16	98:2
encourage	24:2	example	experts
26:18 34:15 40:9	enumerated	85:13 90:17 122:20	74:18,21
encouraged	120:3	excavation	expires
26:15	environment	58:11	127:11
ended	54:14 81:16	exceeding	explain
16:18	Environmental	45:6	90:4 99:21 122:20,23
endorse	79:1	excellent	explained
94:1	envision	125:8	69:8
endorsed	23:18 24:11	excludes	explains
26:12 77:6	equal	63:4	69:15
energy	11:8	Excuse	exploding
50:14	equations	123:23	59:17
enforced	43:7	executive	explore
103:21	equivalent	69:22 108:9	22:2
	97:19		
engage		exercise	expression 89:22
35:16 82:14 116:24	especially 58:3 92:12	69:6	
engaged		exist	extend
26:5 28:21 33:18 36:7	Esquire	30:23	45:13 120:9
41:2	2:9,10	existed	extension
engaging	essentially	11:13	23:21
116:18	48:20 51:3 61:2 110:1	existing	extent
engineer	110:2 114:8	6:15,19 27:18 28:14	24:2 38:16 41:8
39:10 93:13 94:6	establish	48:21 63:20 79:3,12	extraordinary
English	47:14	84:22 92:21 93:6	57:10 58:11
122:20	established	99:18 100:1,7 103:5	extremely
enhance	37:13 87:4	119:23	5:6 60:19 85:20 98:24
13:21	euphemism	exists	eye
enormous	78:7	8:7 78:16	5:24 97:20
50:13 84:7	evening	exit	
enrolled	4:3 6:3 41:15 93:11	31:11 74:4	<u>F</u>
53:6	96:21 102:1	expand	F
ensure	events	59:23 60:1 61:20	82:23,24 83:2
56:3 100:7	57:23	expanding	fact
entire	everybody	24:8 60:3 61:18 99:11	9:12,13 24:20 26:15
11:22 13:15 35:20	98:6,16 122:13 123:5	99:23	40:19 49:16,21 52:12
77:11 78:2 97:17	everyone's	expansion	52:13,21 53:7 63:2
entirely	62:14	84:2	63:23 84:5 91:16
6:22 7:24 10:23	exacerbating	expansive	99:16 105:12
entity	29:2	41:9	factor
61:10 105:13	exact	expect	31:12 34:13 85:21,23
entrance	97:21	39:14 75:22	factors
12:5,8 24:13 31:11	exactly	expecting	50:3
entry	41:7 47:20 65:19 95:6	71:10,22	fail
ľ		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
	I	I	I

93:16	67:14,15 87:12,12,20	find	flexibility
fair	88:21 101:21	63:22 90:19,24	61:20 64:2,4
30:11 96:20	feeling	findings	floor
fairly	42:21	70:3	1:11 12:2 20:9 23:6,6
123:4	feelings	finds	23:7 24:5,5,7 43:3,4
fairness	42:21	108:7	55:22 77:22
68:14	feet	fire	flushed
faith	10:2,10 11:14,19	8:13 12:24 17:3,4,8	33:23
66:15 116:19 118:5	17:16 20:15 23:8	18:1 19:5 28:5 31:6	focus
falls	28:3 43:16,19,23,24	31:14 65:13	5:12 9:17 25:5 41:20
22:7	44:24 45:18,23 46:1	fire-lane	focused
familiar	46:2,7,23 47:1,7	18:19	5:10 39:23 105:24
19:4 40:17 61:5	101:5,6	firm	followed
famously	felt	43:9 78:12 87:18	33:13
65:9	104:6,7,9	114:9,15	following
fan	fence	firmly	4:17 27:7 46:15
38:8	13:17,18	24:21	follows
far	fencing	first	112:1
4:22 8:5 9:14 20:18	13:17 21:10	4:18 6:5 9:17 19:11	foot
21:1 48:5,13,18	fewer	24:5 30:9 47:19	31:9 46:20,22
50:14 71:19 122:8	18:12 80:1	49:16 50:10 53:2,4,5	footage
124:8	fifth	55:24 61:15 63:13,13	9:22 10:7 20:17 24:6
farther	12:2 20:9 23:6 43:3	66:23 68:5 94:11	60:20 91:11
16:15	77:22	99:7 110:9 114:10,11	
fashion	fifty	115:3 116:9 121:12	11:17 23:22 24:4,6,9
37:21 99:11	90:11	fiscal	footprints
favor	figure	27:5	11:15
36:5 72:15 126:8	45:9 100:12 126:3	fit	force
Fax	figures	53:22	51:9
1:18	83:24	five	foregoing
fearing	fill	43:22 52:19 55:13	127:4,6
53:8	62:15	73:19 90:11 96:4,16	forever
feasibility	filled	97:19 121:15 123:7	54:11 55:9
59:19	62:2	five-and-a-half-year	forgive
features	final	68:12	121:21
84:21	12:11 18:24 33:13,20	five-story	forgoing
February	34:6 50:22 51:6 71:9	37:8 43:19 49:17 50:1	113:23
79:22 90:18 91:4	107:8 124:7,9,17	70:23 79:16 85:1,5,6	forgot
97:22	finalized	93:1 94:18	121:21
FedEx	13:23	flabbergasted	form
65:9	finally	88:15	109:13
feedback	75:24 81:5,21 86:15	flattened	formal
21:11	92:13 96:3 97:8	57:24	111:5,7
feel	financial	flaws	former
17:23 37:17 63:2	59:9	83:3 91:1	55:19 87:16
	1	1	1

	1	1	
formula	87:23 94:17 95:5,23	gee	given
43:9 44:20	107:13	115:5	17:23 50:8 70:20
forth	frozen	Geller	82:17 87:21,21 89:19
40:1 69:20 112:3	56:11 90:19	2:3,18 4:3,14 5:20 6:3	97:21
113:11,24 122:5	full	8:10 12:14,15 21:19	gives
127:5	71:4	22:6,20 23:1 24:19	50:22 109:23
fortunate	fully	24:19,24 25:5,8,14	giving
32:6	22:17 56:14	25:17,18 29:13 30:10	41:17 67:12 77:24
forty	functional	30:21 32:12 33:3,8	120:21
9:22	11:11 21:2	33:12,17 34:4,9 35:1	glad
forward	fundamental	35:16,20,24 36:3,5,7	38:7 39:18 64:22
13:24 21:11 29:9,10	26:22 57:19 68:14	38:3,6 41:13 42:24	Gladstone
36:19 47:21 48:9	83:3	50:15 51:13 62:5	3:3 58:20,20 62:7
109:22	funding	70:7 88:20 99:3,20	106:6,8
found	60:5 79:3	100:4 101:20 102:11	glimpse
54:16 77:23	funds	103:24 104:15,24	121:14
four	76:6	105:17,24 106:5,9	go
8:1,20 20:10,22 27:17	further	107:17,23 109:3,8	12:21 16:1,5 17:14
45:19 55:12 93:17	32:19 38:23 47:22	110:7,11,14 111:11	18:24 20:18 21:1
96:4	63:19 77:22 86:18	111:14 116:11,14	40:4,20 45:20 48:15
fourth	115:1 118:1	117:6,9,16 119:1	51:1,5,10 54:10 61:8
23:7	furthering	120:23 121:24 122:7	65:3 66:9 70:2,11
four-bedroom	26:22	122:17 123:10,15	74:16 75:14 83:15,18
10:17 20:19 27:11,14	future	124:1,8,15,24 125:7	95:24 96:8 98:18
60:22	13:10 16:3 18:22	125:14,17 126:1	99:22 100:3,24
four-bedrooms	30:14	general	106:20 107:2,20
7:15,22 8:20 9:2 11:1	F-plus	12:18,20 21:21 40:16	109:22 110:8,18
four-stories	82:24	generally	114:21 115:18
97:18	F7	39:1 51:23 79:16,19	118:23
four-unit	63:20	93:2,2	goal
7:13,21 8:19,24 9:4,6		generated	102:6
9:20 10:14,21 20:8	G	6:6	goals
20:16 28:2	Gallitano	genuinely	7:5
frame	96:21,22	63:8	goes
34:5 111:3	garage	getting	22:11,14 53:12 61:14
frankly	12:8 23:16 43:20,20	19:4 45:9 48:18 73:8	67:13 90:9 100:13
38:8 39:17,20,23	44:5,6,6 81:7	73:14,15 76:6 83:2	103:17 120:2
40:16 48:15 97:16,19	garages	83:17 121:15	going
97:20 109:21	7:17,24 8:22 10:3 15:7	give	4:9 6:2,7 10:18 12:17
Frederick	20:13 27:21 38:8	18:21 32:23 40:21	23:20 31:23 32:9
78:12	76:3,4 89:23	41:10,17 46:23 52:17	33:1,7,23 34:1 43:12
free-standing	garden	74:15 75:13 83:1	43:13 44:12 45:4
7:16 10:3 20:13	57:9,21 77:15 78:11	99:6 107:5 115:17	47:9 48:1,2,2,8 49:18
front	gauntlet	117:6 121:4 123:9	50:9,12 52:9 54:9,10
32:18 42:7 58:24	118:10	125:1	54:10 56:7,15 59:13

60:6,17 61:2 63:11	grants	gun	hat
63:14,16,21 64:16,23	28:8	73:24 74:1,1	89:21
65:20 67:22 70:22		75.24 74.1,1	hate
	grass	Н	
72:5 73:1 74:6,12	56:14	half	123:12
76:8,11,19 80:16,18	Grassmere	9:24 10:13,19 46:19	headline
80:24 81:3 82:10	65:7	71:1 121:15	53:9
83:4,5,14,17 84:20	grass-free		heads
90:10 93:18 94:4,16	18:18	hallways	66:23
94:18 95:1,4,7,8,14	grass-free-type	55:21	hear
95:17,19,21 96:15	18:15	halved	4:18,19 5:5,7 30:12,15
97:11 98:8,10,10	great	9:23	31:19 41:23 43:6
105:2 108:22,23	116:17 124:24 125:1	hammerhead	64:23 116:8,15
114:21 115:5,22	greater	17:6 18:10,11 28:5	120:14,22 122:9,19
119:8,22 120:3	99:22	31:5 39:22	123:16 124:19
124:11,22	green	Hancock	heard
golf	6:18 8:13 11:10 14:20	8:6,7 26:6 27:18 28:15	17:9 25:10,11 29:14
53:20	14:20 18:17,18 38:13	38:16 43:15 46:24	29:16 30:11 54:5
good	56:14 62:14,21 64:6	56:23 57:3 58:19	55:18 59:8 60:24
4:3 6:3 20:1 29:24	64:14,15,17 67:4	60:15 73:18 77:5,14	64:21 66:24 82:9
30:19,23 31:17 53:15	73:7 84:9 88:19	78:11,16,22 79:13	86:6 87:9 89:20 90:5
66:15 67:6,14 82:23	89:16,17,18 91:12	83:22 92:22 105:14	97:6,9,9,10 98:21
83:5 93:11 96:21	greenbelt	hand	112:10 118:18
99:5 102:1 111:14	27:1,13,16,18,22,23	4:11 38:14	121:13
115:1 116:19 118:4	54:3 57:21 61:12	handicapped	hearing
		95:22,23	\mathbf{c}
gotten 58:7 107:4 120:24	77:13,17,17 78:3 79:13 81:6 89:11	handout	1:5 4:4,9,17,23 5:6,10
		44:14	13:4 17:9 28:23
Goulston	92:21 97:13,17	hands	30:14 49:4 61:5
111:23	greenery	41:14	81:24 107:24 113:21
governed	63:6		121:1,3 123:16 124:2
115:14	groceries	happen	124:2
governmental	94:23	34:4 65:15 74:17	hearings
79:4	ground	happened	4:6 19:23 120:1,18
governs	14:16 44:11	122:15	heavily
65:2	group	happening	94:19
grade	112:6	74:19	heavy
15:13 16:17 19:18	growth	happens	94:15
44:21 45:6 46:2	59:19	112:22 113:7	heck
graders	guess	happy	60:23
53:2,4,6 55:24	22:1,15,17 35:10	21:12,13 38:20 80:10	height
grading	47:23 68:4 75:20	81:6 107:15	10:1,18 20:14 23:2,8
15:4	95:13 118:6	hard	28:1 43:3,10,14,23
grant	guidance	37:17 38:1 45:21	44:21 45:5,5,12,17
110:12 121:8	29:11	100:12	45:22,24 46:12,21,22
granted	guidelines	harmony	46:24 47:7,15 98:20
106:19 107:4,8,11	79:21	78:16	104:2,8,18 105:5
100.17 107.1,0,11	, , , <u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>		101.2,0,10103.3
	l	I	l

		I	I
help	4:21	hurried	9:16 27:6
59:9 76:18,18,22	holding	78:19	implemented
helpful	4:7 66:22	Hussey	78:10
65:15 98:17,24	homes	2:5 4:13 24:13,16	important
He'll	8:14 21:8,10 27:3 55:7	29:14,24 30:5,15	31:10,11,12 37:18
8:11	55:11 63:20 78:2	35:2,14,18,21 36:4	39:7 40:16 85:23
Hi 50 20 67 10 00 6 02 2	79:15 92:23	36:10,20,23 38:4,5	88:20,23 92:11 95:12
58:20 67:19 80:6 82:3	hope	40:3,15 41:12 105:4	105:7
87:7 121:10	34:15 54:4 56:1,2,16	123:19	impose
hierarchy 57:12	61:7 64:4 65:17,22 73:1 76:16 89:14	hypocrisy 80:3	117:13
	122:16		imposed 29:6
high 46:23 84:4	· -	hypothetical 46:16	
40:23 64:4 higher	hopeful 34:20	40:10	impossible 121:16
46:9 58:7	hopefully	I	
highest	34:24	idea	impressed 32:15
54:8 77:24	hoping	32:7 74:9 94:1 116:22	impressive
highly	34:21 63:11 124:15	117:2	68:21
74:16 76:2	horrendous	ideas	improve
highway	53:13	6:6	6:24 21:4,9
22:9	horrible	identified	improved
hill	68:19 96:4	28:5 57:3 102:21	21:7 24:21 63:7
1:7 2:17 4:19 6:4 7:3	horseshoe	104:5	improvement
26:6,11,18,19 27:7	61:24	identify	35:5 39:3 62:22 63:8
28:9 41:6 42:5 45:13	horseshoes	102:18	improvements
46:12,13 81:2 87:18	62:2	ignore	12:20 19:13 21:1
105:12	hour	78:9	38:22,24
hills	90:11 95:2 125:12,15	image	inadequate
56:13	125:19	12:9	92:24
hillside	hours	imagination	inappropriate
44:7	67:24 93:20 114:24	59:4	50:2 79:16,24 85:5
hired	house	imagine	93:2
6:10,11	60:20 95:9 96:15,16	21:16 23:7 74:10,12	inch
hiring	houses	95:19 97:15	64:1
60:5	55:9 81:1	immediate	include
historic	housing	106:23	12:2 22:22
22:11 57:6 77:14	34:18 53:21 57:9	immovable	included
78:23 79:1,6 86:7,14	58:16 63:16 84:23	77:8	13:6,13 112:15
109:7,10,13,20,23,24	106:20 108:14	impact	including
110:3,6,8	huge	10:24 11:10 14:10,15	52:17
Historical	38:8 95:7	19:15 27:2,4 31:20	incorporate
79:6 86:7	hundred	31:24 32:3,9 55:6,8	123:1
history	96:16	55:17 59:9,13 79:6	incorporating
57:6 68:12 83:23 84:3	hundreds	93:4 94:8 106:2	99:12
hold	55:18,23 95:1,1	impacts	incorrectly

		I	
8:16	56:18	105:15	job
increase	inspector	issuance	38:19
7:1 13:21 24:3 34:18	100:17 107:2,6,12	36:16	Joe
34:22 54:1 90:8 94:5	instructive	issue	8:10 12:14,15 21:1
increased	49:15	22:16 33:23 40:4 43:3	22:6,20 24:24 25:8
11:12,15 21:2,8 28:17	integral	49:12 50:17,17 60:9	25:17 59:1 100:4
increasing	13:7	60:22 61:5 62:24	Jonas
23:10,14 34:10 97:18	integrate	74:19 90:6,12 93:9	3:8 87:7,7
incredible	93:6 95:18	99:22 101:9 102:5	Jonathan
55:8	integrated	104:2 105:5 114:4	2:4 4:13
incredibly	78:14	issued	Joseph
55:12	intelligent	50:20 108:12	2:18
Independence	123:4	issues	jotting
7:12 10:6 13:5 21:5	intend	19:7,17 22:12 28:18	52:1
57:13 73:9 76:3	13:23 47:11	49:7 59:12 72:14	judge
indifferent	intent	73:20 81:15 100:2	49:4,11 52:8
30:19	41:3 84:24 86:24	102:18 103:4,11,13	Judith
industries	intents	106:7	3:1 51:14 61:16
22:8	18:17	items	Judy
infectious	interest	120:3	63:1 69:6
100:2	45:5	iterative	July
infill	interesting	113:5	33:13,14 124:2,17
6:23 20:12,14 37:7	59:7	I-rub-your-back	June
61:24 62:9,12,13	interject	67:1	1:9 5:22 8:23 79:23
influence	36:24		126:9 127:8
92:18	introduced	J	justify
informal	28:13 53:10 82:8	Jessie	105:11
111:6	introduction	2:3 4:3,13 5:20 21:19	
information	28:24	23:1 24:19 25:5,14	K K
21:12 37:21 40:11	introductions	25:18 29:13 30:10,21	K
41:3,6 52:23 70:8	4:12	32:12 33:3,8,12,17	59:22
90:15 120:19	invalidity	34:4,9 35:1,16,20,24	keep
informed	100:2	36:3,5,7 38:3,6 41:13	64:16
120:4	investigate	42:24 50:15 51:13	keeping
initial	59:15	62:5 99:3,20 101:20	38:13
37:17 50:4 86:22 97:8	involve	102:11 103:24	kept
initially	86:14 97:12	104:15,24 105:17,24	91:12 101:16
73:5 102:18 104:9	involved	106:5,9 107:17,23	Kevin
input	16:8 22:10,13 29:17	109:3,8 110:7,11,14	111:22
6:6 86:8 121:5	32:22 58:14 86:10	111:11,14 116:11,14	key
inside	inward	117:6,9,16 119:1	46:5
94:23	61:13	121:24 122:17	kids
insist	Irene	123:10,15 124:1,8,15	55:18,23 72:5 80:17
48:14 56:2	3:4 67:19 82:6 87:11	124:24 125:7,14,17	81:1,1 95:17,19
insisting	irrelevant	126:1	kind
I			

19:6 49:15 51:4 74:5	2:9	lawyers	Levin
87:8 91:20,23 92:18		111:23	2:19 6:3,4 20:3 23:6
104:4 122:4,5	L	layout	23:12,16,23 24:1,10
King	labeled	58:8	24:15,18 36:16,22,24
3:2 56:20,20	91:22	leads	54:19,20 99:14
Kleckner	land	90:13 95:10	licenses
2:15 116:13,16,16	47:6 56:18 77:16 78:3	learned	79:4
knew	99:12 103:18	94:3	light
123:23	landmark	lease	49:7 65:2
know	91:22,23	61:10 100:24 101:18	
15:19 21:24 22:4	landscape		lightly 89:5
	54:11	102:19 103:5,15,19	
31:17,23 32:1,5	landscaped	103:22	likelihood
34:13,20 36:10 37:9	63:3	leave	74:18 85:20 86:4
37:11,20,24 41:23	landscaping	67:8,11	liking
46:18 48:11,14 53:1	13:22 21:10 54:13	leeway	66:9
53:4,5,24 55:15,15	63:6	82:17	limit
56:6 63:3 64:14		left	46:10,11 115:15,16
66:15,21,21 69:11	large 15:21 18:14 60:19	4:12 16:10,11 41:16	limitations
71:7 72:23 73:8 74:4	62:18 63:12 97:12	legal	82:15
74:4,9,22 75:18 76:6		4:15 26:3,4	limits
76:12,16,19 78:7	larger	LegaLink	5:23
82:9,10 83:1,3,7,9,16	6:20 31:21 67:6	1:15	Lincoln
84:17 86:9 88:19	largest	legally	1:16
91:5,9,10,17 92:9,15	53:21 57:8 83:22 84:2	88:14	line
93:13 94:11 96:12	89:8	Leichtner	11:14 13:22 16:24
98:1,2,13,23 104:17	lastly	3:1 51:14,14	41:16 51:9 62:21
105:3,7 107:10 111:4	85:18 98:13	length	74:23 75:1,2,3,4,5,7
113:1 114:4 115:13	last-minute	11:23 17:5	75:9,10 76:1 99:23
115:16 119:5 121:18	49:1 77:7	letter	100:6,13,20,24,24
122:5,13,21,23 123:6	late	48:12,16 49:13,21	103:15,15
125:9	73:11 125:21	79:9 85:3 87:4	linear
knowing	late-in-the	letting	11:19 20:17
82:17	49:1	37:9	lines
known	law	let's	45:8 63:24 77:8 85:8
78:8 90:23	68:14 69:5,8 72:15	9:16 10:24 43:18	85:10 88:1,7,9 89:20
knows	78:12 87:18 91:24	45:20 46:16,18 63:17	99:8,9,14,15 102:19
88:9	92:12	64:11,12,16,17 74:2	102:23 103:5,21,22
Koocher	Lawrence	75:12 83:12 99:6	103:23 105:8,10
3:10 121:10,10 122:1	60:1	107:3	Liss
122:19	laws	level	2:7 4:12 30:20,24
Krakofsky	45:3 47:4	39:6 43:21,22 44:4,5	35:13 109:24 114:6
1:21 127:1,10	lawsuit	44:10,11 45:6,23	114:20 125:16,24
Kristen	92:9	82:7 87:20	listen
1:21 127:1,10	lawyer	leverage	5:1 41:21 112:5
Krokidas	75:17 82:14 116:21	100:12	listening
	ı	1	ı

65:17,22 67:10	look	58:23 74:11 89:3	78:24 86:7,14 109:6
little	9:16 10:24 21:11	low	109:10,13,19,22
13:3 17:21 40:7 45:21	25:16 29:10 32:9	85:20 86:4	110:8
50:5 60:13 61:16,19	40:6 43:18 44:2	lower	Massachusetts
65:10 69:4 71:13	45:11 47:20 48:9	46:20,23	1:12,17 79:1,5 127:3
82:2 95:3 98:2 100:3	52:18,20 55:3 56:13	lowering	MassDevelopment
live	69:1,15 73:1 74:16	16:19	11:9 21:14 48:15 49:6
36:19 42:1 43:1 67:20	81:23 90:14 91:4,4,5	lowest	49:10,12,19 50:8
77:1 80:7 87:3 88:22	101:2,10 121:5,19	44:22,24 45:6	51:2,5,7,10 55:14
89:1,2,15 93:12	looked	lucky	70:10,20 79:9 85:3
96:19,23 119:6	9:10 12:21 15:21 91:2	72:5	87:17 97:23 106:13
lived	92:5,10 104:3,11	L104	106:14,15,16,17
42:2 96:23	looking	44:14	107:1,9,14,20,21
living	25:3 40:24 52:7 60:14	77.17	108:1,4,7,18,18,21
96:5	63:13 104:9,17 123:9	M	108:24 110:19 111:2
local	looks	M	111:8
81:9 113:18 114:3	44:9 84:8 95:6 125:5	2:10,11	MassDevelopment's
118:19	loom	main	108:19
locate	54:9	12:5 24:13	MassDOT
89:22 103:1	lose	maintain	28:10
located	62:23 63:16	15:4,8,10,11 18:16	MassHighway
4:8 8:4 10:6 16:2,12	lot	maintained	22:8
27:15	14:11 15:20 21:12	14:20 17:15	massing
location	23:19,19 38:9,10	maintaining	10:16 28:20 50:1 62:2
15:2,11,12,15 16:14	44:22,24 45:7,8 46:9	16:22	63:12,19 77:24 79:15
17:12 18:11,11 77:11	46:19 49:18 55:3,4	major	80:14 93:1
88:5 100:20 126:4	56:17 60:23 61:9,19	35:7 57:13 62:15	80:14 93:1 massive
88.3 100.20 120.4 locations	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	63:18 70:18 71:24	54:7 76:10 89:8
17:16 77:16 100:13	63:24 64:10,11 66:21 67:23 70:8 73:2,14	74:20	
	*	making	master 50.11.12.16.60.4
lock	74:23 75:1,2,3,4,5,6	19:13 44:10 70:14	59:11,13,16 60:4
115:17	75:9,9 77:7 80:24	85:23 91:24 101:15	match
lodge	85:8,10 87:9 88:1,7,9	management	92:3 113:9
108:14	89:1,20 99:9,14,15	19:10 21:7 81:18	material
loft	99:16,19,23 100:6,15	manner	120:7
10:1,15,19 32:7 78:7	100:24 101:18	99:15	materials
lofts	102:19,23,24 103:5	mark	119:19,21
11:6 20:21 28:24	103:15,15,17,20,21	2:6,19 4:13 6:4 12:15	mathematical
60:24 80:15,15	103:22,22 105:8,10	12:16 14:1 56:12	43:7
logical	106:2 125:5	marked	matter
39:11	lots	8:16 114:16	49:16 90:10 113:16
long	44:17 45:15 51:20	8:10 114:10 Mason	matters
5:6 39:23 96:17	73:6 103:7		4:15
125:13	lousy	3:2 56:21	mature
longer	53:14	mass	6:19 8:10 11:10,19
46:8,17 48:3	love	6:23 9:17 22:9,9 69:13	14:1,22 15:19 21:4

	1	ı	1
14:1,22 15:19 21:4	31:6,13 72:20 112:7	88:16	35:10,16 36:15 126:6
27:24	memory	mitigate	move
maximum	42:11	93:4	6:20 13:23 36:19
44:20 45:22	mention	mitigated	39:24 75:1,2,3,3,5,6
mean	83:21 101:11 123:15	79:17	75:9 94:23 95:15
44:21 45:6 46:2,11	mentioned	mobilize	100:20 124:17
47:4 49:7 65:19	20:19 21:2 23:2 24:20	82:13	moved
94:24 95:18 118:10	36:11,13 49:24 59:5	model	8:1 9:8,14 12:5 20:7
118:12 120:16 122:6	62:24 73:3 74:3	5:21,21 37:1,3,3,9,15	21:8 27:17 28:13
meaning	Merrill	40:4,5,20,21 41:5,8	57:13 61:24 73:10
49:9	1:15	71:11 91:14,14	89:4 122:9
means	met	121:24 122:1	movement
25:6 46:1 79:18 117:2	7:4 102:4,22 104:8	models	95:11
measure	112:6,7	40:16 114:23	moving
45:15	MHC	modification	8:6 10:8 16:14 25:6
measured	86:13	18:7 52:13	29:9 38:22 54:21
44:16 45:5	middle	modifications	61:11 75:9 99:12,17
measures	37:3 88:10	4:10 5:10,17 6:16 7:6	104:4
90:6	mildly	7:7,19 9:21 10:14	multiunit
meet	68:17	11:24 12:2,14,17,19	77:23
7:6 9:12 12:23 33:15	mile	13:8,14 16:7 19:16	municipalities
33:18 35:8 81:10	46:19	20:4 21:14,18,21	29:6
86:22 104:18 114:18	miles	23:5 32:15,20 33:2	municipality
126:4	90:11	39:19 50:18 52:5	69:23 108:10
meeting	million	68:4 70:9 82:12,20	mysteriously
18:23 47:17 51:15	59:19 60:2 76:21	83:12 112:12,15	79:10
58:21 59:18 67:21	mind	118:4,11,16	mystery
81:12 82:4,18 87:8	66:4 116:21 125:2	modified	97:23
93:14 94:21 95:12	minds	8:23 38:18 41:19,20	M.5
96:22	66:1 103:20	113:7	20:7
meetings	minimize	modify	M05
25:10 33:6 68:20 72:9	27:4 55:16 61:4	15:4 19:19	43:15,18 46:19
74:24 91:17 102:17	minimum	moment	M5
121:12	17:19 31:9	104:16	6:21 8:1,3 9:9 10:8
Mel	minor	money	31:24 54:21
2:15 116:16	70:17	111:1 114:7	
member	minus	months	N
2:6,7 47:17 51:15	46:22	7:4 19:8 26:2 70:19	nagging
56:22 58:21 59:18	minute	morning	125:2
67:21 76:24 80:6	73:23	30:9	Nagler
82:4 87:8 96:22	minutes	Morris	2:9 4:16 50:16,19 69:7
111:9,12 124:22	21:22 22:2 43:8	55:18	106:12 107:22 108:3
125:5,11,18,20,22	misbehave	mother	109:5,9 110:3,9,12
members	87:23	89:2	110:16,22 111:6
2:2,21 6:4 26:7 30:11	misrepresentations	motion	113:15 114:3 115:9

116:5 118:18 119:17	negotiate	70:14,20 71:3,4,4	109:13
119:22 120:11	26:9 30:4 72:22	73:15 77:11 79:2	notify
name	negotiating	84:20 91:14 92:12	69:21 106:15
41:17 42:1 43:1 46:18	74:14	93:19,23 100:23	notion
56:20 67:19 76:23	negotiation	119:20 122:10,24	98:7 99:7 104:18
93:11 96:21 111:22	29:17 72:19,20,24	126:2	106:1
116:16 121:21	74:22	newer	November
Nancy	negotiations	123:1	6:8 127:11
3:6 80:6	30:2	nice	number
narrow	neighborhood	62:22 63:17	1:6 6:16 9:17,19,20
94:22	26:20 42:6,16 43:16	ninth	11:6 15:18 23:10,14
narrower	51:18 52:17 53:23	27:16	23:15 26:24 27:2,4,9
62:20	54:15 56:23 66:12	nominal	27:10,19 34:11 39:1
national	68:20 72:7 73:11	24:3	44:12 60:18 78:6
57:5 78:23	76:18 78:2 79:14	nominally	80:12,12,17 84:4
natural	80:20 81:4 82:13	23:8	99:5 100:5 102:17,18
44:21 46:2 57:23	88:22 89:7,16 90:20	nonconformance	115:7,9,13
78:13	91:15,21 92:4,23	101:3	numbers
nature	95:18,19 96:1,2,12	nonconforming	104:11 122:9
49:2 97:4	96:14 125:12	99:16,19 100:9 101:14	
nearby	neighborhoods	101:15 105:2	O
80:18	40:17 93:5	nonconformities	objection
nearly	neighboring	100:1 102:10,24 103:9	74:20
9:22 11:12,20 20:16	21:8,10 44:17 46:9	nonsense	objectionable
necessarily	78:17 80:24	42:16	68:17 69:3 97:4
38:12 98:24	neighbors	non-40B	objectives
necessary	6:24 8:5 9:15 14:15	102:10	7:7 26:23 54:17,18,21
104:7	52:23 53:16 68:1	normally	54:22 55:1
need	71:6 73:3 81:22	51:11 106:18	obligated
5:4 6:17 36:17,24	90:21,24 91:4 97:11	north	110:18
40:22 41:23 48:4	99:1	7:10,12 56:21	obligation
50:12 63:6,6 69:1	net	notably	71:18 98:14,23
72:14 75:19 81:24	23:4 34:19	28:19	obstacles
83:7 84:14 85:11	Netter	Notary	22:5
90:1 101:21 106:11	2:10,11 4:14 6:10 30:1	127:2,10	obtained
115:23 119:20 120:9	33:11 37:11 40:8	note	109:19
120:15 121:6 123:6	115:3 116:10 118:17	5:9,20 12:11 30:7	obvious
needed	120:13 123:14,23	36:14 53:3	9:11
9:11 37:14 120:18	never	notes	obviously
needs	42:9,13 73:12 94:10	67:23 73:2 127:7	31:13 33:21 47:18,19
5:21,21 37:22 38:12	115:3	notice	48:4 84:13,23 102:7
40:11 48:8 70:20	new	82:15 111:7	119:11
71:23 83:10 106:13	8:8 12:10 44:3 47:24	noticing	occasion
negatively	48:10,22 50:12 52:6	90:22	81:20
59:13	55:18,23 58:3,3,6	notification	occasions
	, , - , - , - , - , - , -	-	
	I	I	I

102:5	30:8	114:17 115:7,11,19	99:8
occurred	open	originally	parents
116:1	4:22 8:9 11:11,13	14:4 77:19 87:4 104:7	53:3
odds	19:18 21:3 26:24	outcome	park
98:9	27:23 38:13,19 48:13	91:6	95:16
Office	*		
	55:1,3 63:2,3,4,5	outcropping 77:18	parking
1:10	78:5,13 81:20 96:6 102:24		7:1,18 8:4,5,7 9:11,12
officer		outdoor 77:21	9:14 11:18 15:9
69:23 108:9	opening		17:20,21,22 23:10,11
official	94:2	outside	23:12,16,17,18 28:12
111:17,20	opine	27:17 96:7	28:13 29:3 35:4,4
officially	68:2	out-of-scale	43:20 49:18 54:1
48:21	opinion	77:23	55:3,4 57:17 58:1,4
officials	29:7 34:18 72:18,22	overall	62:16,19 63:1,5 73:5
53:16 88:17	104:1,8	12:16 29:8 31:1,16	73:6,14 78:4 81:6,10
oh	opinions	77:12	81:11,19 84:13,14,15
52:9 91:18	41:24	override	84:15,16,18 94:15,16
okay	opportunities	81:8	94:20,22 95:8,15
6:2 22:24 25:14 30:5	26:17 121:2	overwhelming	101:11,13,14,14
36:5,23 41:12 43:24	opportunity	55:8	103:6,6,7
66:7,12 67:10 105:19	4:21 25:15 33:21	owners	parkland
107:2 109:8 116:5,14	47:21 64:13,17 68:23	28:16	77:20
124:15	81:23 82:1 121:1	O'Flaherty	parkway
old	123:21 124:20	111:18,22,22 114:1,10	13:11 21:24 22:11
48:3 68:18 83:18	opposing	116:3,7 117:7,8,20	28:11 39:8 94:2,6
91:14 123:2	77:3	119:3,14,16	98:5
Olmstead	optimistic		part
78:12	68:9	<u>P</u>	13:8 16:7,20,22 19:16
omit	order	Pages	29:15 45:4 55:15
45:4	4:4,18 5:22 40:22	1:2	57:1 66:13,19 71:3
once	61:11 99:6	paper	77:14 84:22 104:23
41:5 42:18 64:12,18	ordinance	51:23 69:2 71:21	105:14
84:19 108:3 115:10	118:21,23	120:1	participated
onerous	ordinarily	papers	26:8
66:5	108:8	76:1	particular
one-bedroom	original	paradise	39:1,5 64:24 91:20
20:22	6:17 7:9,11 8:15,16	73:13	99:6
one-bedrooms	27:15 29:8 39:5	paragraph	particularly
7:16 8:21 9:3 12:5	43:23 44:2,13 45:4	44:15 69:15 70:2,5	49:24 50:3
60:18,19	48:19 50:5 54:12	113:24	parties
one-hundred-and-s	56:4 57:10,19 58:4,8	paragraphs	106:20
122:7	77:4,10 78:10 79:8	75:11	pass
one-quarter	87:1 93:20 104:6	parcel	17:24
44:22 45:7,10,16	111:13 112:17,21,22	102:10 103:1	passed
online	112:24 113:6,6,8	parcels	69:2 76:1
		I	ı

passing	122:22	125:9	120:21,24 121:4
17:8 51:22 71:20	percent	picture	120:21,24 121:4
pass-through	11:8,15,16,18,22	58:23 62:6	122:10,24 123:1,2,2
			′ ′ ′
31:9	14:21 45:9 84:2 90:9	piece	plane
pat	91:19 94:5	39:7 51:22 69:2 71:21	14:16
83:1	perfectly	103:18 120:1	planned
pattern	118:14	place	77:15
93:6	perform	50:10 59:16,20,22,23	planner
paved	37:15	60:4 63:19 81:13	31:20 32:9
57:24	peril	85:14 87:8 88:4	planning
pavement	116:17	94:11 100:4,18 127:5	2:13 4:20 6:5,14,15
17:13,15,18 19:10,24	permanent	places	7:3 12:23 22:18
24:22 33:24 93:15	94:11	54:7 57:6 61:17 75:7	25:22 26:1,3,4 30:7
paving	permission	78:23	35:18,23 54:17,20,22
18:15 73:13	30:6 109:19	plan	54:24 55:5,16 60:15
pedestrian	permit	4:11 5:13,16 6:17 7:6	72:17 73:19 88:3,6
78:15 95:11	6:9 10:13 28:8 36:17	7:9,11 8:23 9:10	102:3 112:6 114:19
pedestrians	50:20,21 74:15 77:5	10:6 13:1,1,13 14:4	plans
57:19 95:14	106:19 107:4,5,6,10	14:12 16:10 18:5	5:10 11:14 12:17,21
peer	107:11 108:12	21:21 26:11,17,19	13:24 14:8 19:1 21:6
6:11,12 21:17 25:11	109:15,18 110:10,13	27:8 29:8,9,22 30:20	22:23 30:8 41:19
28:21 29:9 30:15	110:21 112:16	30:21 31:2,2 32:10	47:24 48:1 60:10
31:20 32:19 33:6,8	permits	32:11 38:18 39:5	81:18 84:17 90:6
35:6,11,16 37:14,24	79:4 102:14	41:2,11,21 44:2,3	107:3,5,7,13 112:24
40:5,9,10,12,19,20	permitted	47:24 48:1,2,3,10,19	113:23 115:12
41:1 48:7,18,24	86:20	50:11,12,18,23 52:4	planted
			42:11
58:15 71:7,23 78:19	permitting	52:6,7 53:9,10,12,15	
90:14,14 91:2 114:7	22:13 98:3	54:1,5 58:17,24	plantings
114:22,24 118:3	person	59:11,14,16,21,21,23	15:8
120:8 123:17,20	50:16 75:18 95:23	59:24 60:4 61:8	plastic
pending	123:5	66:13 67:24 69:14	65:12
29:22	personally	70:20 71:3,4,4,6	play
penultimate	32:8	73:15 74:19 75:14	53:3 78:5 92:1 100:13
72:16	persons	77:13 78:14 80:8	115:17
people	95:22	82:7,9,20 83:8,9,11	playing
4:5 5:1,2,9 19:22	persuasive	83:11,11,15,15,17,18	42:6
41:15,16,18,22 52:19	49:24	83:19,24 92:20 95:6	please
52:23 55:20 59:5	perversion	97:7 111:16,17,17	5:12 12:11 41:22 62:6
60:23 66:21 67:24	87:1	112:2,3,9,11 113:6,6	107:5 111:10 123:9
68:19 69:9 71:6 72:7	pervious	113:8,11,16,19,20,20	plus
74:10 81:15,22 82:1	19:10,12,24 24:22	114:8,14,16,17 115:5	10:1,15,19 11:17
87:9,22 88:2,22 89:1	33:24	115:11,17,17,18,19	44:24 46:22 83:2
89:15,16 94:22,23	phrase	115:21,22 117:2	point
95:1 96:5,10,17	123:18	118:22,24 119:2,9,11	5:3 15:16 16:1 18:21
100:5 118:13 120:22	pick	119:13,15,17,20	21:20 25:23 35:2
100.0 110.10 120.22	F	117,110,110,117,20	21.20 25.25 55.2
	I	I	I

44:8 47:22 48:14 powers presenting problems 49:9 52:11 54:8 68:5 7:7 26:12 19:22 98:12 100:1 69:5 presents 69:16 70:14 75:23 practical procedural 77:24 84:6 86:15 83:6 113:16 98:11 82:7 94:13,14,21 95:10 **Practically** preservation procedure 96:18 101:3 103:2,10 114:6 56:22 57:1 64:7,15 51:21 103:14 105:19 practice 78:13 86:6 procedures 106:16 111:19 115:8 preserve 82:16 118:17 119:8 124:20 precedent proceeded 6:18,19 62:20 102:7 pointed 47:14 51:4 preserved 50:3 75:19 100:5 27:23 88:21 **Precinct** proceeding 47:17 51:15 58:21 107:20 points preserves 19:5 94:24 67:21 82:5 87:7 8:9 proceedings 96:22 pressure 4:1 126:10 127:4 poke 97:20 process precondition 38:22 39:6,9 **Policy** 85:22 86:17 presume 6:10 16:8 21:23 22:6 predict 79:1 50:11 22:10,14 26:14 39:14 120:16 40:10 50:13 51:6,17 popular pretty 57:16 preferable 48:13,13 50:19 53:13 51:21 68:15 75:23 population 110:23 74:8 98:16 103:3,10 98:18 101:24 104:5 preference 59:6.17 115:1 104:23 109:4 111:5.7 populous 41:4 prevent 112:20 113:5 115:14 91:19 preliminarily 22:4 117:23 121:3 122:23 5:16 30:17 124:16 porous prevents processes 93:15 preliminary 99:10 102:14 28:23 29:19 33:9,19 position previous produced 37:16 40:2 41:9 31:2 32:11 78:4 112:1 118:20 119:7 professional positive 48:12 49:7,10,12 previously 60:11 123:17,20,22 11:4 23:7 30:22 77:8 29:7 72:18.22 93:13 primarily professionals positively premature 60:6 21:15 70:11 24:7 68:2 prior possibility professor prepare 22:1.3 32:19 65:4 74:7 26:19 93:21 68:8 71:5 72:2 68:14 69:8 74:8 85:7,11 prepared private program 20:5 22:10 49:2 possible 47:5 57:17,18 77:21 49:19,21 113:13 7:2 8:5 9:15 15:24 114:15 117:21,22 91:17 programing 22:22 27:1.5 35:23 preparing 38:11 pro 47:19 38:21 67:2 41:4 43:14 61:5 project 85:12,15,16 86:11 present probably 11:8 26:6 29:9 36:18 6:7 49:4 76:15 82:10 65:4,13 73:7 74:8 86:2 93:24 115:15 120:20 49:13 56:3,4 57:12 problem potential presentation 58:15 62:1 63:9 13:10 16:3 99:24 4:18 12:13 29:21 48:4,7,17,24 59:17 65:24 70:3 71:24 78:20 79:2,22,24 presented 90:13 91:17 106:6 power 51:1 69:4 71:18 76:17 20:4 25:15 82:12 97:7 problematic 80:13,19 81:13 90:3 76:22 28:6 121:22 92:17,21,24 94:8

95:21 109:11,12,22	protect	18:17 103:23	72:16 75:13 105:4
110:4 116:20 117:14	57:2	pursue	109:6 111:9,15,19
projects	protections	60:6	114:11,12 115:2
73:18	102:15	pursued	120:12 122:18
		39:15	
project's	proven		questioned
50:1 69:19 79:12,15	20:1 93:15,16	pursuing	88:12,17
pronouncement	provide	60:5 66:15	questioning
34:14	21:23 25:23 28:10	purview	33:6
proper	37:21 41:7 115:10	108:2,20	questions
32:23	123:21	push	4:21 5:15 19:9 21:13
properly	provided	16:14 113:2 124:11	21:20 23:1 43:13
31:8 112:20	5:17 26:16 86:8	pushed	47:9 52:3 98:14,14
properties	providing	65:13	99:5 106:10 116:8
14:10 16:15,17 79:7	28:23	pushing	123:10
property	provisions	37:16 60:20 101:17	quickly
11:14,23 13:15,16,18	105:23 113:23	124:14	52:2 104:10
13:22 14:19 16:17,24	provocative	put	quid
28:16 54:8 56:11	43:12	30:8 42:8,17 44:19	38:21 67:1
68:15 77:11 86:7,9	pseudomathematical	47:7 53:2 55:21,22	quite
86:21 102:8 105:13	44:20	58:24 59:11 60:22	40:16 48:11 51:23
106:3	Pu	62:5,16 63:12,15	53:12 54:19 69:7
proportion	3:7 82:3,3	72:11 73:6,13 74:1	98:9
55:12	public	75:7 81:3 85:13,14	quo
proposal	2:21 4:23,24 5:13 21:4	95:8 96:8,11 112:11	38:21 67:2
13:4,6 32:18 43:23	29:11 41:14 57:18	117:12 118:7 120:19	quote
48:21 49:16 50:4,5	61:15 71:22 73:9	puts	69:15 76:15 78:5 79:2
56:12 57:20 58:6	81:24 87:13,22,22	38:22	79:11
69:19 70:24 72:4,8	105:7 113:2 120:21	putting	quoting
77:7,9 78:3,4 88:8	121:3 123:21 124:19	18:15 55:10 101:12	113:17
97:21 106:6 111:13	126:3 127:2,10	113:11	
112:22 117:15 125:8	publication	P.C	R
propose	52:22	2:11	ra
76:8 112:2 119:11	publicly	p.m	67:14,14,14
proposed	117:5	1:9 4:2 126:10	rainy
4:7 19:14 26:6 32:16	puddingstone	1.9 4.2 120.10	68:19
34:13 44:23 50:1	54:7 77:18	0	raise
62:10 77:15 79:15,18		qualify	30:19 106:6
*	pull	105:22	raised
79:22 83:12 92:24	17:22 62:13 113:3	qualities	30:15 39:20 112:8
93:1,5 97:14	pulled	54:12 58:19	ramps
proposes	62:12,15	quality	44:5
77:19	pulls	92:17	ran
proposing	18:1	question	21:14 70:9
13:8 16:7 62:17 98:6,7	purpose	36:10 43:13 47:12	
104:13 114:18	34:17	52:6,11 61:7 65:19	ranges 48:13
117:19	purposes	J2.0,11 01.7 0J.19	TU.13

reach	received	114:16	94:15
26:9	21:15 51:19 70:10	regarding	relief
read	receives	58:10 83:19 121:20	102:12
54:18 72:7 89:12	41:6	region	relocated
93:21 108:5 118:18	recommendation	57:9	8:2 9:6 12:7 15:14
123:6,7	120:13	register	27:13 38:24
reading	recommendations	57:5,6 78:23	relocating
111:1 114:1	113:4		9:4 39:2
real	reconsideration	regrade 16:19	relocation
63:8 101:3	50:8	regrading	15:3
realistically	reconsidering	15:8	relying
96:17	48:5	regs	94:19
realize	record	69:14 89:12 108:5	remain
43:6 46:17 56:1	77:3 93:16 112:14	110:22 111:2 119:3	29:4
realizes	redesign	regular	remainder
48:7	25:2	103:22	99:16
really	redoing	regulations	remaining
14:14,15 32:8 37:2	120:18	44:16 49:8 50:19	10:5 99:19 103:19
43:4 47:3 49:7 51:20	redone	69:13 89:11 107:7	remains
51:23 54:19 56:6	48:8,9	118:19,21 120:4	113:6
61:19,20 63:6,11	reduce	reissued	remember
64:24 65:8 66:11,20	6:23 10:1 27:2 81:19	48:16	55:23 59:6 118:23
68:1,5,24 70:23	reduced	reiterate	remembers
71:17,24 72:1,1 73:8	9:3,17,18,21 10:10,16	57:8 85:2,19 86:15	65:9
74:12 76:21 81:23	11:16,18,21 20:14,20	reject	remind
82:2,13,21 83:20	20:24 27:10,11,16,20	49:18 50:4,9 70:24	41:18 72:2 98:5
85:22 86:9 94:10	28:2 78:6 84:1	rejected	reminiscent
97:19 100:11 104:3	reducing	97:22	60:12 73:18,20
112:13	19:12 39:1 80:11	rejecting	removal
Realty	reduction	48:21 71:5	8:11 10:16 54:6
1:7 2:17 4:19 6:4 7:3	10:7,18 11:6 35:3 55:5	rejection	remove
26:6,11,18,19 27:7	55:6	70:21	63:16,17 101:13
28:9 41:6 42:5 46:13	reductions	relation	removed
87:18 105:12	23:3	58:8	7:24 12:3 14:7 20:6,10
rear	referred	relationship	20:10,11,13 32:5
100:14	50:7 52:4	16:23	42:14,18,19 92:16
reason	referring	relationships	removing
51:7 55:14 66:7 86:12	36:21	57:18	54:23 101:11,13
89:4 103:14 106:1	refers	relatively	render
reasons	52:5 70:2	69:4	99:15,18
92:17 110:4,5	reflect	releasing	renew
reauthorize	113:22	52:13	4:12
107:21	reflecting	relevant	renovations
recall	61:16	59:14	79:3
60:18	regard	reliance	repeat
	8		
	I	I	I

68:6 92:13 97:1	requires	45:12 84:20	48:18
rephrase	22:9 54:5	restriction	revised
111:15	research	99:17	26:11,19 29:8 30:20
replaced	60:8	result	30:21 42:7 52:4
28:6	reserve	8:8 34:19 79:18 120:5	58:23 60:10 61:8
report	31:18	resulted	77:7,9 80:1 97:7
4:19 25:23 33:9,13	residence	10:18	102:22 103:7 111:17
37:16,17 41:9 71:9	92:22		112:2 113:19,22,22
73:21,22 104:14	residences	resulting 57:12	
123:20,22 124:7,9	1:8 4:5 78:17 79:14	retain	115:11,21 118:22,24 119:1
		21:16 26:24 55:1	
Reporter	resident		revision
1:21 127:1	56:21	retaining	77:22 115:5
reporting	residential	8:12 11:21 14:4 16:9	revisions
29:17	27:9,15 77:5	21:9 28:3 33:24	117:24
reports	residents	80:11 89:24 90:2	revisitation
33:20 124:21	31:13 57:14 61:10	rethink	124:4,18
reprehensible	77:20	85:12	revolves
51:23 56:19	resolution	review	102:5
represent	74:13	6:12,12 21:17 25:12	re-review
51:18	resolved	27:6 29:4,9,21 30:16	33:21
representative	28:19	31:20 32:19,23 35:6	rid
26:13 74:24	resource	35:12,17,23 36:2	76:10
representatives	57:23	37:1,2,14,24 40:9	ridiculous
2:17 21:20 26:2,17,21	resources	48:6,8 58:15 78:19	49:14,20 56:10 68:2
28:19 76:14 102:4	57:2 78:13	78:24 83:20 86:8,11	96:7 98:9
represents	respect	86:13 90:14,14 91:2	right
87:16	4:24 60:14 71:15	93:24 102:5,14,21	23:11,19 24:10 34:6
request	87:20 102:19 103:5	108:8,23 113:1,2	72:10 74:6 94:17
49:23 56:12 104:11,21	respected	114:7,22,22,24	96:7 100:6,24 102:13
108:3,17 121:7	54:13,14,14	115:14,22 119:9	104:24 112:20 120:9
requested	respecting	120:8 121:4 123:17	125:6
86:12	38:19	123:17	rights
requests	respects	reviewed	68:16,16 102:6,6,8,9
108:11 118:2	50:6	37:5 79:5 101:23	risk
require	respond	reviewer	51:4
36:14 79:3 83:10	82:1 98:24 116:8	28:21 33:6,9 35:17	road
required	responds	40:5,11,12,19,20	2:22,23,24 3:1,3,4,5,6
23:18 35:4,11 58:12	25:4	41:1 71:8,23 123:20	3:7,9,10 7:10,11 8:14
92:3 107:6 109:11,12	response	reviewers	8:17 39:6,9 42:2
120:19	25:20 30:13 31:14	21:17 25:11 48:24	43:2,21 44:4 45:24
requirement	82:14 99:4 116:15	118:3	47:17 51:16 55:9
11:9 64:8 81:10 104:8	rest	reviewing	58:21 62:19 65:1
104:19	39:17 96:12 101:10	28:22 41:19 88:18	67:20 73:9 77:1 80:7
requirements	122:12	93:20	82:4 84:7,8,9 93:12
39:13 69:20 70:3 92:4	restrict	reviews	94:2,4 96:23 98:4,5,7
57.15 57.25 70.5 72.T			7, . 70.25 70. 1,5,7
	l	I	I

98:11 121:11	safe	schools	103:12
roads	74:12	32:4 53:4 55:17 59:10	seek
54:2 55:4 57:13,14	safety	scold	37:23
73:6 94:23 95:20	12:20 21:4 31:12	87:24	seen
roadway	74:20	scope	4:22 30:18,22 41:2
22:7	Sam	27:6 48:11	69:1 87:23 115:4
Robin	4:15 50:16 106:10	Scott	sees
3:10 121:10	Samuel	3:3 58:20 68:10 73:16	41:11
7.10 121.10 rock	2:9	74:15 86:16	selectmen
54:7	satellite	scratch	73:22 76:24 80:7
role	94:15,20	48:5,9	87:16 106:22 108:11
92:1	satisfied	· ·	109:1
	112:18	scurry 72:6	
room			semi
100:20 123:5	satisfying	sea	57:16
rooms	75:10	45:23	semiprivate
55:21	save	seat	57:21
rough	15:1,21 59:1 81:20	72:3,11	send
38:15 41:14	saved	second	49:22,22
roughly	11:19 14:2,22 15:15	24:4,7 30:13 35:13	sense
113:14	15:16,18 21:3 122:6	47:12 88:13 114:11	40:21 41:7 51:3 52:1
round	saving	117:8	64:2
30:13	31:16	Seconded	sensitive
rudimentary	saw	126:7	5:8
37:1	13:4 122:24 125:4	Secondly	sent
ruled	saying	80:15 94:1	85:4
110:20	40:6 45:14 61:16 63:1	secret	sentence
rules	67:11 68:6 75:16	51:22	72:16
86:10 110:1 113:18	88:13 117:11,11,20	section	separate
114:3 115:10	120:14	17:8	109:9,10
run	says	sections	separated
5:13 104:11	44:20 45:5 79:19	17:20	57:16
running	92:19 108:18,21	see	separation
90:21	110:3	7:9,12,19 8:8,15,17	78:14
rush	scale	14:17,23 30:5 35:21	series
95:2 120:20 125:12,15	97:13	37:19 38:7,20 39:18	4:6
125:19	scene	40:5,20 42:10,13	serious
Russet	18:1	43:16 44:3 45:21	68:15,16 71:24 72:14
42:2 47:16	Scharf	46:7 47:4 56:13	80:12
Russett	3:4 67:19,19	61:23 62:1 74:2	seriously
2:22,23,24 3:3,4,6	school	75:12 80:10 81:7	71:20 89:10
8:17 43:2 55:9 58:21	27:5 29:2 42:3,4,7,12	83:12 90:18 95:5	serve
65:1 67:20 80:7	42:22 53:2 55:19	97:16 119:23 120:3	77:20 84:10,19,21
95:20	59:6,7,20,22 60:1	120:20 121:6 122:16	served
	65:3 72:6 80:18 81:2	125:12	84:8
S	125:19	seeing	service
	I	ı	I

31:6 94:16	82:14 115:20 121:5	55:7,11 63:20 78:17	78:5
services	shorthand	79:14 80:20 92:23	Society
39:19	127:7	sit	86:8
servicing	show	68:10 88:15	solution
18:12	12:21 13:1 14:2,8	site	59:22
sessions	18:24 44:13 52:24	6:14 7:9,11 12:14,18	solve
26:5,8,14,16,21 30:2	62:4 72:8	12:18,19 15:20 16:10	13:2 106:8
76:15 100:10 116:2	showed	16:20,22 19:18,19	somebody
116:18	102:22	21:1 28:22 30:20	62:24 116:4
set	showing	36:1 50:2 56:9,12	something's
69:20 98:11 103:3	15:16 18:7 41:14	58:23 61:8,13,17	114:5
113:23 117:12 127:5	shown	62:21 64:18 73:15	somewhat
setback	14:4 16:10 17:16,20	76:5 77:12,24 78:14	87:10,11
7:17 11:13 100:9,15	114:14	78:21 79:17 92:19,20	soon
100:24 101:7	shows	93:3 101:10 119:23	93:24
setbacks	19:3	125:3 126:2	sorry
7:1 21:8 28:15 92:24	side	sitting	114:1 122:17
100:23 102:20 103:6	7:10,11,20 8:17 9:12	74:24	sort
sets	12:6,9 13:16 14:5,5,6	situation	14:17 21:23 60:19,20
36:15 112:3	14:7 15:5,6 16:17,18	46:16 88:1 112:24	60:21 125:2
setting	16:21 17:1 20:8	six-foot	sorts
58:10	24:15 31:23 37:6	13:18	106:7
seven	57:17 58:2 62:1	size	sought
9:19 10:20 20:13	64:24 75:8 84:6	34:10	51:6
27:20,21 43:21 44:3	100:14 101:5,6,7	sized	sound
44:11 97:19	103:2,4	6:20	84:3
seventh	sidewalk	sizes	Sounds
43:4	95:6 96:1	34:20	105:17
seven-story	sign	sleep	south
70:23	40:22,22	96:8	1:8 4:5,8 12:6,9 24:15
shape	significance	sleeping	34:17 61:10
58:8 106:1	14:3 42:10	78:7	so-called
sharp	significant	slide	38:13 68:3
97:20	8:13 29:5 32:15 57:4,8	75:16	space
shawl	57:23 77:14 78:12	slightly	6:18 8:9,13 11:10,12
108:15	significantly	100:20	11:13 12:7,10 14:20
shed	8:9,10 11:21	slippery	14:20 18:17,18 19:18
14:13,19,21	similar	122:4	21:3 24:4 26:24
shock	8:7 50:9 65:14	small	27:23 29:2 31:17
97:15	similarly	61:2 76:7 90:7 96:11	38:9,11,13,20 55:1,4
shocked	59:24 62:16	smaller	60:23 63:2,3,4,6
72:1	sincere	15:13 23:3 57:14 67:5	64:14 67:5 73:7
shop	42:21	smart	77:21 78:5,7,13
40:21	single-family	65:5	81:20 84:9 88:19
short	27:3 28:14,16 53:21	soccer	89:4,16,17 91:12

spaces	91:11	64:15,16 100:8	streets
8:4 9:11,14 17:22	staff	Steinfeld	64:24 80:24 81:1,4
23:10,15,19 29:1	6:5,14,15 7:3 21:16	2:12 25:24 26:1 29:19	90:8
57:12 88:24 101:2	26:8 29:7 30:3 37:16	30:6 31:1,18 36:1	strict
speak	40:8 72:18,23 102:3	41:1 52:3 54:18	38:12 53:11
6:2 8:10 24:19 41:15	102:3,21 112:7	122:6 124:6,13	stringent
41:17 50:17 101:22	120:17	· ·	37:12
		step	
124:20	stage	108:24	strongly 40:9
speakers	22:18	Stephen	
68:7,9 98:22	stand	2:24	structural
speaking	101:22	Steve	59:12
58:13,22 76:24 80:8	standard	47:16 55:13	structure
98:15 110:24	26:14	Steve's	121:23
speaks	standing	52:11	structures
50:16	75:16 76:1	stick	39:2 100:2 101:12,13
special	standpoint	97:20	struggle
102:14	83:7 110:24	stipulation	93:9
specific	Stantec	57:11	student
15:20 25:1 44:15 85:4	43:9	stock	84:11
111:2 116:11 122:9	start	115:17	studied
specifically	30:24 35:11 41:17	stone's	73:21
6:17 31:4 43:2 47:13	43:12 45:18 67:7	96:14	study
97:24 105:9 109:17	73:13 81:17 82:21	stop	59:19 94:4,14
specifics	85:11,15,16 99:7	65:11 107:19 109:4	stuff
83:19 122:8	started	119:24	114:7
specify	40:23 82:23	stories	subject
103:6	starting	9:24 10:13,15,19,19	39:13 78:24 80:20
speed	25:2	14:17 43:22 44:3,11	102:13 110:14
90:7	state	55:12,13 96:4,4,16	113:20,23 115:22
spend	11:9 22:14,17 26:15	stormwater	119:6,8 120:8
21:22 47:18 111:1	36:12,15 39:13 57:5	6:11 19:9,13,19 21:7	submission
spending	74:5 79:4 87:15 98:3	29:3 124:4,11,18,19	8:16 112:17
114:7,22	98:4,8	Storrs	submit
spent	statement	111:23	28:9 72:4 107:24
50:13 93:19	53:8 72:17 93:14	story	109:12 112:21 115:6
spoken	33.8 /2.17 93.14 states	115:20 121:5	submits
89:1	113:18	straight	113:19
	state's	straight	submittal
spot 56:18 95:15	79:21		4:10
		strain 81:3	submitted
spots	statue		
95:22	42:8 109:9	straining	5:11,18,19,22 6:8 31:2
spring	statute	101:3	108:4,17 112:24
96:6	37:13 105:20,21,23	street	115:21 119:13,18,21
square	109:14 110:6	1:11,16 5:24 43:21,22	120:8
9:22 10:7 24:6 60:20	stay	44:4 89:1 95:17	submitting

48:22 111:7,16	support	25:15 43:18 45:14,18	tentatively
subsequent	24:10 89:16 119:21	48:10 52:20 63:14	124:3
49:8	supposed	67:8,11,12 71:19	term
subsequently	80:2 84:18,22 121:22	76:17,22 81:23 89:5	123:18
6:9	supposedly	90:16 94:9 98:14	terms
subsidizing	65:6	110:2 112:8	21:24 23:9 81:5 98:18
50:22 69:21,24 108:6	sure	taken	106:12 121:17 122:8
108:15 substantial	13:7 33:3 35:7,14 38:23 52:1 64:5	73:2 89:10 92:15	Terrace 3:2 56:21
69:14 70:19 72:13	65:23 67:12 69:11	123:19 127:4,7 takes	terrible
75:10 76:6,20 106:18	82:11 95:7,22 100:17	17:12 39:8 125:13	53:13 55:13
106:21 108:8,19,22	125:4	talk	testimony
substantially	surface	12:17,24 13:3,10	4:23,24 5:13 30:12
78:20	9:13 28:12	15:23 41:5 43:2 75:1	41:13
substantive	surfaces	talked	testing
92:17	11:17 19:12	12:16 14:1,11 17:5,17	98:19
substitute	surprise	18:6,15 22:1 61:14	thank
115:11	97:15	65:18	6:5 12:15 21:19 22:24
succeeded	surprised	talking	25:18,24 29:12,13,24
73:8	69:17 121:7	62:4,9 63:13 64:10	30:10 32:12 36:8,23
successful	surrounding	68:15,16 83:7,8,8	41:12 42:24 47:15
54:13 56:4 87:5	80:19 93:4	123:3	50:14,15 51:13 58:19
Suddenly	suspect	talks	62:7 67:17 82:2 87:5
88:9	35:8	103:18	93:10 96:20 99:2
sufficiently	suspended	taller	103:24 121:9,11
66:1	126:10	75:7	123:9
suggest	swallow	target	theme
60:7 61:14 75:6	110:2	104:5	84:17
123:13 124:14	switch	Target-sized	theory
suggested	83:16	95:8	98:19
117:24	system	taught	they'd 51:3
suggestion 61:19 75:24 125:1	18:16 19:10,14,19,21 20:1 25:2 27:5 34:1	42:3	thing
suggestions	93:15	team 7:5 29:15	13:14 16:24 30:9 48:6
6:16 76:8	S7	teams	50:6,7 56:8 71:2
suggests	6:18,21 9:16 10:7,9	31:14	74:5 88:14 91:8
64:1 76:2	11:5 12:4 14:15 20:6	technology	95:11 101:5
suitable	20:10 31:23 54:21	20:1	things
79:11		tell	12:22 14:11 15:23
Suite	T	52:23	17:5 19:8 49:23 52:1
1:16	Tab	telling	59:10 60:13 61:3
summarize	53:9	54:24 59:2 71:21	66:23 67:5,6 68:8
20:3	table	114:19	73:4,17,17,20 75:12
supply	32:5 85:9 117:4	tenable	76:12 83:21 85:3
94:7,9	take	113:16	87:9 94:3 101:11

104:22 105:21	97:8 112:9	77:8 82:11 89:3	95:24 96:4
118:13 120:15	thoughtful	91:11 115:16	towering
121:19 122:9,14	6:6 51:24 121:5	Tom	78:1
123:6	threatening	96:21	town
think	66:22	tomorrow	1:10 2:15 6:9,11 13:12
6:1 14:13 17:16 18:5	three	5:22 29:23 36:8 37:15	16:6 19:9,20 20:2
19:1,6,21 22:20	8:19,19 10:2,10,17	40:5 41:3,5 71:11	22:21 26:13,20 28:19
25:10 30:24 31:10,16	11:12 20:14 21:3,9	121:23	28:21 29:7 30:4
31:24 32:7 33:10	26:22 27:11,22 28:3	tonight	32:22 39:21,22 42:22
35:20 38:5,21 39:1	28:3 50:3 82:18 90:1	6:7 7:8 20:4 26:12	47:17 49:5 51:15
39:11 40:2 42:4	91:13 93:16 114:24	30:9 41:19 53:3	53:15,16 54:15 56:1
43:10 51:21 52:15	three-bedroom	58:22 67:13 68:18	56:4,16 58:16,21
53:5,10,13,24 54:23	11:2,7 20:20,23 60:21	69:18 71:7 97:3,7,16	59:12,18 66:12 67:21
55:2 56:19 57:6	60:21	98:15,21 99:1 119:13	68:12,16 72:18,23
58:13 60:10 63:1	three-bedrooms	tonight's	76:20 80:4 81:12
64:24 66:22 68:1	7:15,23 8:21 9:2	4:9,17 5:9	82:4 87:7,14 96:22
69:10,11 73:10,11	throw	tons	97:10 103:16 108:10
74:17,17 75:21 76:3	64:18 96:14	54:6	112:6,7 115:16 116:6
80:15,18 81:3,22	throwing	Tony	116:17,20
82:7,16,21,24 83:13	73:23	98:21	townhouses
85:7,10,19 86:16	time	top	58:9
87:3 90:3 91:20	5:8,23 18:6,24 25:13	8:17 10:11 43:19	Town's
92:11 94:3 96:10,13	32:20,22,23 33:1,4	46:12 49:17 54:7	7:6 26:3,4,16,21 29:2
96:19 97:23 98:9,16	34:5 35:7 37:20,23	81:2 96:5	113:2
100:19 101:6 103:2	38:5 47:18,18 50:12	topic	traditional
105:6,17 106:10	50:13 51:21,24 52:12	4:11 116:12	17:12
112:19,20 113:15	52:17 58:24 66:23	topography	traffic
114:5,11,13,18 115:2	69:1 71:16 81:17	63:21 79:17 93:4	6:11 12:20 13:5 21:5
117:11 118:8,8 119:5	93:21,22 108:15,20	total	29:3 39:10 58:1
119:7,9,24 125:7	111:1,3 114:7,22	7:14,22 9:1 11:6,8	64:23 65:1,16 80:23
thinking	116:24 120:10,21	15:18 20:6 27:9,10	90:5,6,8,11 94:3,4,6
81:17 92:19 123:24	121:4,7,12 124:10	119:18	94:14,21 96:7
124:1,3,6	126:3 127:5	totaling	transcript
thinks	timely	8:20	127:6
51:17	37:22 49:22	totally	transportation
third	times	77:23 78:9 109:10	81:18 98:2
18:8	5:5 93:17	touch	treated
thirty-six	timing	104:15	103:15
9:21	37:12 110:23	Touloukian	trees
Thornton	tiny	6:12,12	6:19 8:10 11:10,19
57:14 65:7	94:8	tour	14:1,22 15:1,2,3,10
thorough	today	56:9	15:12,15,16,18,19,21
78:19	117:12 118:8	tower	15:22 21:4 27:24
thought	told	43:14 46:3,14,24 47:7	31:16 42:11,14,17
38:8,10 74:7 91:18	33:8 42:15 59:1 60:17	49:3 76:10 95:16,16	56:13 63:16,17 80:11
			

122:6	8:18,19 9:7,19,24 10:1	4:10 5:16 22:17 39:12	53:19,19 54:21 55:17
tremendous	10:5,11,13,15,18,19	40:8 48:23 69:3,7,9	62:23 77:5 80:2 84:4
31:17 81:3	10:20 11:3 14:5 18:7	69:10 78:18 89:10	84:7,10,14,16,19,22
tremendously	18:8 21:9 27:18,20	99:24 101:20 104:20	88:10 89:22 91:9
65:15	28:3 35:22 41:10	104:21 110:11	unknown
tried	43:13 47:9,24 50:3	117:10,22 118:1,20	52:24
112:5	71:8 76:4 93:21	117:10,22 118:1,20	unlimited
trigger	97:24 100:22 122:22	123:6,8	47:15 94:7,9
86:11,13	two-bedroom	understanding	unobstructed
truck	20:21 27:12	20:2 37:13 47:23	11:11,20,22 14:12
17:13,24 65:9,13	two-bedrooms	48:22 104:16 105:10	20:17
trucks	7:15,23 8:21 9:2 11:3	115:21	unreasonable
8:13 17:9,24 65:14	12:4	understood	52:15
true	two-story	13:7	unrelated
64:3 127:6	12:7 43:20 49:17 76:7	undertake	58:4
trumps	78:2	29:21	unsettling
75:18	two-week	underused	88:18
trust	40:13	76:2	unthinkable
45:21	Tymann	underutilized	97:21
try	49:11	77:16	upgraded
21:13 51:24 56:3 61:4	types	under-thing	37:3
68:2,6,20 70:15 72:7	10:24 20:18	95:4	Upland
75:14 100:4 101:17	typical	unequal	3:5 77:1
116:7,19 117:1	10:12	87:13	upper
trying		unfair	14:16
22:16 37:19 39:7 40:6	U	52:15	upsetting
40:9 51:18 61:3	ugly	unfortunate	117:4
95:18 103:12 114:13	89:23	32:6	upside
118:7	ultimately	unfortunately	57:20
turn	119:22,24 120:2	32:4 67:7	urban
12:13 16:11 17:6,14	unanimously	UNIDENTIFIED	28:21 31:20 32:9
18:3	73:22	111:9,12 124:22 125:5	
turned	unbalance	125:11,18,20,22	124:7,9,16
57:20 66:15	64:11	unique	usable
turning	unchanged	103:16	63:2 78:5
94:18	14:21 58:12	unit	use
turn-around	underdeveloped	10:24 20:18,23 92:2	17:6 19:10 20:1 31:17
8:12 17:12 28:7 31:5	24:12	units	59:3 61:20 72:14
tweak	underground	6:20,21 7:14,22 8:1,2	77:7 84:20 93:4 95:3
70:17 82:22 83:4	44:6,8,8 76:4	8:20 9:1,4,5,8 10:8	useable
tweaks	underline	10:17 11:1,2,3,7 12:3	6:18 11:11,12 21:2
33:22 85:15,17	30:1	12:4 20:5,6,7,7,19,20	26:24 27:22 55:1,3
twelve	underneath	20:22,22,23 23:15	63:4
9:18	24:11 62:16	27:9,12,12,14,17	uses
two	understand	28:24 34:11,21,23	78:15
LWO		20.24 34.11,21,23	10.13
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

	I		
utter	VII	90:1,2	37:4,10
66:24	1:1	want	week
T 7	village	5:6,7 18:2,24 22:2,22	37:4 82:9 93:21 97:6
V	8:6,8 26:7 27:18 28:15	30:18 43:2 47:4,8,14	124:12
vacant	38:16 56:23 57:3,9	59:1 63:15 66:11	weekends
77:16	58:19 60:15 73:18	71:14,14 72:2 74:17	93:22
vacation	77:6,14 78:11,16,22	75:5 80:10 81:5,7,21	weeks
72:5	79:13 83:22 92:22	83:14,17 84:6,14,15	41:10 71:8
variance	105:14	85:2 86:15 87:10	well-financed
102:14 104:19	virtually	92:13 93:13,15,18	71:10
various	121:16	96:3 97:24 98:5	went
68:3	virtue	104:21 106:2 114:20	6:14 10:19 65:10 90:1
Varrell	10:16	116:7,8,24 117:4	114:16
3:9 93:11,12	visible	118:6,13,16 119:6,22	weren't
vehicle	12:12 88:24	120:3 121:11 123:18	63:14
12:22	visit	123:19	west
vehicles	56:9 124:23 126:2	wanted	7:10,11,20 13:16 14:5
39:24	visual	13:6,19 20:3 30:1 53:1	14:6 20:8 31:23
vehicular	27:2 54:11 55:6,8	54:2 55:16 73:6 82:6	61:24 84:6
57:16,18 58:1 78:15	vis-a-vis	83:6 84:16 104:1	western
verifying	80:19 106:14	116:6	103:1
101:24	volume	wants	we'll
version	1:1 90:7	43:6 52:18 58:16	19:11,13,14 20:1 21:9
13:1 77:12	volunteers	113:10	22:16 25:15 29:22
versus	71:16	warrant	33:20 35:8 38:23
33:24 49:6	voted	81:14	59:3 96:19 99:5
VFW	57:5 60:1 91:20	Washington	117:3 118:4,20 119:6
13:11 15:24 18:22		1:11	121:5 125:8
21:24 28:11 36:13	W	wasn't	we're
39:8 64:20 66:10	wait	42:18 49:13 65:10	4:4 7:7 13:8 15:1,16
74:4 85:19 86:12	71:7 72:3 88:12 96:8	72:19 88:20 119:4	17:13 18:7,12 19:12
94:2,6 98:5	108:23 110:19	125:14	19:16,19 21:12 23:8
vice	waiver	water	25:1,3 31:2 32:20
56:21	104:7,10	90:18,19	37:11 47:24,24 48:2
view	walk	way	48:8 60:4 61:5 63:16
5:24,24 6:14,24 11:20	6:14 57:15 62:3	4:12 16:5,5 18:10	64:8,9 67:10 68:15
14:12,15,19,21 29:5	walked	19:17 25:3 34:9 40:6	68:16 71:5 73:14,14
39:9 62:14 63:10	15:19	40:21 45:16 62:10,14	78:18 80:10 83:7
96:18	walking	62:21,23 64:11 82:7	88:15 98:10 100:16
views	65:3 81:1	83:9 86:11 96:13	105:23 108:23
11:11,22 20:17	wall	107:18 115:15	111:20 113:11
vigorous	8:12 14:6,9 16:9,16,16	119:10 120:22	114:14,17,19,21,22
81:12	16:18,21,21,22 17:1	ways	114:23,23 115:5,6
vigorously	walls	61:21 81:18 92:2	117:20,21,22 119:5
39:16	11:21 14:4,7 21:9 28:4	Wednesday	124:15
	I	I	I

we've	94:7 112:5 114:15	56:5 60:15,24 72:3	02445
4:6 8:4 9:13 16:24	work	73:7,19 87:5 96:24	1:12
17:11,11,15,23 18:5	19:5,20 20:2 22:21	103:19 115:4 121:15	1.12
19:1 20:5,16,19,20	25:12 33:20 35:7	123:7	1
21:7 29:19 30:11	36:3,4 37:19 57:2	yesterday	1
37:6 47:6,6 50:5,13	61:3 66:11 71:16,24	123:2	6:22 7:13,20,24 8:24
66:23 86:6 99:5	103:12 105:3 118:8	you-rub-my-back	9:20 10:22 26:24
107:4 112:10 114:14		67:1	46:20,22,22 70:2
	126:1	67:1	115:7
119:7,19 121:14	worked	$\overline{\mathbf{z}}$	1-127
123:8	7:5 21:6 53:17,18	ZBA	1:2
wide	100:12 101:17	7:8 28:8 41:2 53:16	1.2
48:13	working		
wider	13:12 16:6 18:1 26:5,8	56:1 65:24 72:19	7:23,23 11:2,8 20:20
17:19,22 100:22	26:13,16,21 38:1	80:21 82:15 83:10	23:8
width	52:19 76:15 100:10	86:11,14 98:18	10th
17:7,15 100:22	116:1,18 120:17	107:19,23 108:3	33:13,14 124:3,17
William	works	zone	11
3:7,9 93:12	59:24 100:16	88:19 89:10	23:8
window	worried	zoned	119
96:7	35:6	43:16	53:2,4,5 55:24
Windows	worse	zones	12
96:6	55:13	89:12	27:15 84:8,10
wish	worst	zoning	121
24:24 67:2	77:10 85:14,16	1:5 9:13 44:15 45:1,3	3:1 51:15
withdraw	worthy	47:4,13 81:9,10,13	123
83:14	37:2,3	81:15,17 88:3 103:22	11:19 15:18 21:3
withdrawn	wouldn't	103:23 104:12 106:7	128
79:10 111:13 119:15	62:22,22 66:6,13 67:3	115:10	11:6 20:11
withdrew	90:22 94:8	Zuker	13
49:23	wrap	42:5 54:2	7:15 8:20
Wolfe	19:6	Zuroff	13A
2:22 42:1,1	writing	2:6 4:13 23:2,9,14,21	46:17
wonder	69:21 75:18	23:24 24:8 32:14	14-story
48:20 50:7	wrong	33:5,15 34:2,6,10	46:3
wonderful	51:18 123:12,13	104:1,20 105:6,19	143
106:5	wrote	106:4 111:19 114:4	46:2
	73:21 120:15	117:10,18 119:12,17	143-foot
wondering 40:15,19 89:24 92:5,7	75:21 120:13	120:6 121:9	46:14
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Y		146
word 53:11 72:20 118:22	yards	\$	96:23
	96:15,16	\$2.5	15
wording	year	60:2	7:14 8:21 69:24
35:14	56:10 70:24 76:21	- 	156
words		0	45:24
35:22 36:3,18 46:8	years 42:3,3 52:20 53:18	02111	43:24 16
79:8,10 82:8 84:2	42.3,3 32.20 33.18	1:17	10

9:8 47:17 51:15	20130094	101:5,5	3:9 93:12
58:21 67:21 82:5	1:6	300	
87:7 96:23	2014	11:15	5
161	1:9 79:23 127:8	314	5
3:6 80:7	2017	84:1,5	1:9 7:15 8:21,22 12:5
17	127:11	333	69:15
20:21	22	1:11	5th
17th	11:7,18 20:21 28:24	35	8:23
127:8	31:9	43:16,18 44:24 45:18	50
127.8 1 79		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	42:2 96:15,15 103:19
	22-foot	46:7,22 47:1	530
1:16	17:17	35-foot	53:18,19
18	22-foot-wide	43:24	542-0039
11:7 20:20	17:15,19	36	1:18
180	226	7:14 20:6 53:19	542-2119
121:17	11:5	37	1:18
180-day	23-foot-wide	11:16 20:24	
115:15	17:17	383	56.04
184	24	3:3 58:21	69:13 70:4
20:6 27:10 55:17	9:1 12:3,4 20:9 27:11	4	56.041
19	249		69:20
12:4	3:7 82:4	4	57
19th	25	7:13 8:19,24 10:21	9:13
33:12 123:16 124:16	42:3 45:9	20:8,15 46:6,21 47:1	6
126:9	250	70:5	
192	3:4 67:20	40	6th
27:10	262	8:20 20:7 84:2 93:19	1:11 5:22
1946	2:24 47:16	40A	60
53:15 86:23	265	102:6,10,15,24	11:14 94:5
	2:23 43:2	40B	617
2	269	1:7 4:7,15 6:10 26:6	1:18,18
2	2:22 42:2	26:14 27:6 29:6	68
7:16 9:3,5 20:24 27:2	27	34:17 55:16 69:4	53:18
115:9	8:4	77:4 81:8 88:8 89:11	694
2,640	28	101:18 102:6,8,8,16	46:23 47:2
46:21 47:1,7	11:1 20:7	104:22 105:11,15	
20	285	109:10 110:1,5	7
7:22 17:16 73:7 96:23	121:10	112:23 114:3 115:8	7
20,000	299	115:14 118:20	8:21 28:2
54:6	45:23	40B's	7:00
20-foot		80:2	1:9
7:17 11:13	3	401	7:03
2011	3	1:16	4:2
63:14	7:15,21 8:18 27:4	402	7:30
2013	115:13 127:11	84:1	125:22
79:23 97:22	30	45	72
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			43:23
			I

			<u> </u>
	-		
760			
69:13,20 70:4			
79			
14:21			
8			
8			
8:2 9:2,2,2,4 20:5			
59:22			
8:30			
125:16,17			
80			
11:22 55:20 90:9			
91:19			
80s			
73:11			
81			
20:10 27:11			
83			
43:24 122:6			
84			
27:24			
843			
83:23			
88			
11:5			
9			
9:58			
126:10			
94			
3:5 77:1			
99-year			
103:19			
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>